



Library of
Wellesley College.
Presented by



Nº



- & B. Daniellson

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume VII.

WITH ETCHING OF REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
BY H. MANESSE.

London :

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCLXXXVIII.

[All rights reserved.]

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

List of Contributors to Volume VII.

- REV. PRINCIPAL D. BROWN, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. PROF. S. IVES CURTISS, D.D., Ph.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. W. L. DAVIDSON, LL.D.
REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. G. ELMSLIE, D.D.
VEN. ARCHDEACON F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
REV. PROF. F. GODET, D.D.
REV. R. F. HORTON, M.A.
A. TAYLOR INNES, M.A.
DR. A. NEUBAUER.
T. E. PAGE, M.A.
REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.
REV. F. RENDALL, M.A.
REV. F. HERBERT STEAD, M.A.
REV. PROF. G. T. STOKES, D.D.
REV. PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.
REV. PROF. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A.
PROF. A. S. WILKINS, LL.D., Litt.D.
REV. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Ph.D.
THE EDITOR.

CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN ENGLISH EXEGESIS.

COMMENTATORS in various ages have taken widely different views of the duties which are required of them ; for they have had to satisfy expectations which are altered from time to time, and they have been influenced by shifting opinions about the books which they desire to explain. They have been necessarily moulded by the spirit of their own epoch, by its current theology and by its intellectual limitations. Hence have arisen the divergences between the methods of different expositors, in spite of the universal habit of plagiarism and repetition, which, alike in theology and exegesis, has tended for centuries to stereotype unchallenged errors. There has been indeed in the history of exegesis a continuous advance of the tide, in spite of occasional retrocession of the waves ; and it has not been in vain that so many noble intellects have devoted long years to the study of the sacred books. Their toil has accumulated a mass of valuable materials into the treasury of religious thought. When we study a great modern commentary we are indeed heirs of all the ages. The Masorets laboured to preserve the integrity of the Hebrew text. The Fathers concentrated their best powers upon the task of explaining Scripture. Origen has meditated for us ; Augustine has crystallized many subtle aspects of truth into brilliant expressions ; the school of Antioch has bequeathed to us the fruits of its integrity and straightforwardness ; the Schoolmen have mapped out with precisest definition every province of theology ; the Mystics have turned upon the sacred page the light of their spiritual intuition ; Nicolas of

Lyra revived the literal sense, by breaking the drowsy spell of a baseless tradition ; the Reformers lent us the aid of their deep piety and masculine genius ; the post-Reformation age, though paralysed by its confession-worship and Protestant scholasticism, rifled every storehouse of illustration which was then available ; Cocceius firmly grasped the conception of a progressive revelation ; Grotius and Le Clerc added complete independence of spirit to their vigorous learning. Everything which has been achieved by men so manifold and so diverse in their gifts as Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Chrysostom, Gregory, Bede, Bernard, Rupert of Deutz, Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Bengel—or by the specializing erudition of such men as Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wettstein, Selden, Bochart, the Buxtorfs, and very many other labourers—all this, and much more that cannot now be mentioned, is at the free disposal of the modern commentator. Whatever tends to spiritual edification is furnished for him in boundless profusion in the writings of whole schools and generations of previous divines. He may avail himself both of the full illumination of necessary learning, and of the innumerable sidelights which so many centuries of research and ingenuity have brought to bear upon his sacred theme.

It does not therefore imply any overweening vanity in the greatness of our own age, if we say that perhaps at no previous period of history were men so favourably circumstanced for the acquisition of sound information and true understanding of the meaning of Scripture. Never was biblical knowledge more constantly increased or more widely diffused. Our living scholars may bear comparison with the ablest of their predecessors ; but even if they were dwarfs they stand upon the shoulders of giants, and even if they were personally inadequate they can draw upon inexhaustible materials. In all respects—unless it be in the

diminution of leisure caused by the strain and pressure of modern life—they stand on the same level of endowments with those who wrote in former ages, and they can fix their own starting point at the goal of their fathers.

For these reasons the science of exegesis has in the last half century made unwonted strides, and has produced works which future ages will not willingly let die. It is intended that other writers, in future pages of *THE EXPOSITOR*, should deal with the characteristics of separate commentators. I am therefore precluded from dwelling on individual merits, but I am invited to point out some of our general gains. I do not undertake the presumptuous task of attempting to review all the exegesis of the last fifty years. To do this would require larger space, wider knowledge, and greater ability than I can command. But I may perhaps be able to indicate some distinct elements of progress which ought to make us deeply thankful for the past, and to inspire a hopeful courage for the future.

1. It is no small gain that the true province of exegesis is beginning to be better understood and more rigidly defined. It has in consequence gained greatly in precision of aim. In many of the commentaries which are now consigned to dusty shelves we are encumbered and fatigued by masses of irrelevance. Let the reader turn to any of these old commentaries which were based on the “fourfold sense,” and he will see the narcotising spell exercised by that fantastic hypothesis, and by the fatal facility of expansion, digression, and sheer imagination to which it inevitably led. A large mass of the folio pages, densely crowded with homiletics under the heads of allegory, anagogy, and the *moralis sensus*, would be at once swept aside as useless and unpertinent by any living exegete. Our modern students are not forced to wade through the interminable verbosity of the thirteen folio volumes of Tostatus the

“Stupor mundi, qui scibile discentit omne,”

or the measureless prolixity of the professor who lectured for forty years on Isaiah, and had never got beyond the first chapter. It is now well understood that the task of the expositor is not to make each text a theme for endless discussions. His main object is to discover the exact and primary meaning of the sacred writer, and to set it forth in such a manner as shall best enable the student to apprehend and profit by its original intention.

2. And this being so, we must count the attention which is bestowed upon *the text* as a boon of the first importance. An *apparatus criticus*—or at any rate the best results which such an *apparatus* can furnish—is now regarded as indispensable for any important commentary, though for many centuries the Septuagint or the Vulgate, with all their errors and corruptions, were regarded as sufficient for textual purposes. Even Erasmus had to work with only sixteen MSS. of secondary importance; modern scholars can refer to 1,760, of which some are of primary value. Great as is the debt we owe to the toil of Erasmus, Ximenes, Stephens, Walton, Fell, Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, and others, how much has been done since their day! Even during the present reign, Lachmann's New Testament appeared in 1842 and 1850, Tischendorf's in 1859, Tregelles' account of the printed text in 1854. A closer and closer approximation to the original apostolic autographs in the New Testament has been achieved by the labours of Dr. Scrivener, Canon Westcott, Professor Hort, and their fellow workers. Keen study and unwearied toil have been bestowed, not only on the collation, classification, and estimation of MSS., but also on the consultation of lectionaries, on the evidence furnished by ancient versions, and on the numerous quotations in the Greek and Latin Fathers. The materials thus accumulated become practically exhaustive. As yet the text of the Old Testament has not received the same microscopic attention, partly because the results must

be less immediately important, partly because the text was for ages so carefully preserved, and there is a complete dearth of very ancient manuscripts. There are no complete MSS. of the Old Testament which are *certainly* older than the tenth century; most of those which have been hitherto available belong to the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. But in the last century much was achieved by the labours of Walton, Houbigant, Kennicott, De Rossi, and others. Considerable study has been devoted in recent times to the Septuagint by scholars like Frankl, and it is well known that Dr. Hatch has been long at work upon a dictionary of the Septuagint, which cannot fail to be of extreme importance even for the Hebrew text. The Talmud, the Targums, the Midrashim, and the works of eminent Masorets have all been translated or are in course of translation by living scholars. It is probable that before another fifty years have passed there may be numerous contributions to this department of biblical research. We seem indefinitely distant from the days when the learned Puritan John Owen declared that it savoured of atheism to suppose that the text of the Bible had not been miraculously preserved from every error.

3. But a purer text would be comparatively valueless unless there had been a proportionate advance in the scholarship requisite for its interpretation. A volume might be written on the curious mistakes which occur in the writings of the Fathers and Schoolmen, from their general and almost inevitable ignorance of the original languages of Scripture. Of the Fathers, how many were acquainted with Hebrew? To mention only the greatest of them, Origen's acquaintance with Hebrew was far from being critical; and though St. Jerome could speak Hebrew, and deserves high credit for the extreme trouble which he took to acquire it, yet even he can hardly be said to know it in the same critical sense as not a few living scholars. St.

Augustine knew nothing or next to nothing of Hebrew, and confesses that he could never command the patience to master even Greek. Among the Schoolmen, the very greatest of them all, St. Thomas Aquinas, knew comparatively little of either language, and is sometimes curiously misled by the Latin text. Down to the end of the fifteenth century Nicolas of Lyra († 1340) seems to have been almost the only great commentator—except some stray Jewish convert like the reactionary Paul of Burgos († 1435), or Perez of Valencia († 1492)—who even attempted to study the Old Testament in the original. It may be urged in their defence that they were unable to estimate the importance of doing so, and, further, that there were no available grammars and dictionaries and very few Jewish teachers whom they would have liked to seek. But ever since the days of Reuchlin the facilities for acquiring Hebrew have been constantly multiplying, and the language now forms part of the curriculum at the universities and theological colleges. Far greater are the strides made by Greek scholarship in England since the days of Bentley. St. Chrysostom wields the Greek language with all the power of a consummate orator; yet it is hardly too much to say that there are some of the finer niceties of Greek scholarship which have been better appreciated by modern theologians, who have thus been able to give a truer explanation of the intended meaning than even Chrysostom himself. Philology too, which is a science still in its infancy —has aided and enriched our modern scholarship. At no previous period has classical Greek been more thoroughly mastered, or the special peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect been more generally and accurately understood.

4. If it be the chief function of exegesis to make known the exact meaning of the sacred writers, we may point to the Revised Version as one of the most invaluable of commentaries. When a revision of the Bible was proposed by

Mr. Heywood in the House of Commons, the opinion of most of the bishops was against him ; but in 1862 Bishop Ellicott, to whom English exegesis owes a great debt of gratitude, declared that the Authorized Version contained misconceptions, inaccuracies, errors, and obscurities, which it was vain for a timid and popular obstruction to deny. We may regret that the revisers were not always entirely courageous, not always perfectly consistent ; that not unfrequently they have put the best and truest renderings in the margin, as in Gen. xxvii. 39, xlix. 10 ; that they have not ventured to emphasise the difference between *διάβολος* and *δαιμόνια* ; and that other necessary changes have been postponed :—yet the English nation is under deep obligation to them. Take the writings of St. John and St. Paul alone, and consider how much we have gained by the observance of distinctions in the Revised Version and the abandonment of half a dozen different renderings for one and the same word. For instance, in the Authorized Version of 1611, “ abide,” “ remain,” “ dwell,” “ tarry,” “ continue,” “ being present,” are all used for St. John’s one *μένειν*, and five different words for St. Paul’s one *καταργέω*, and five to represent *μαρτυρία*. In the opposite direction we had *one* word only for twelve words meaning “ destruction,” and one for seven meaning “ child.” In the Revelation how much we gain by the rescue from obliteration of the distinctive words *θρόνος* and *θρόνοι*, of *στέφανος* and *διάδημα*, above all, of *θηρία* and *ξῶα* ! Vividness and accuracy have been restored to the meaning of the sacred writers in multitudes of instances by paying attention to their use and omission of the article, and by the accurate rendering of their profoundly significant tenses. Never before had the great mass of the people so easy a means of knowing what the Apostles and Evangelists really said, as that which has now been placed in their hands by the best efforts of the best of our living scholars and divines. Who can estimate

even the theological importance of the changes necessarily introduced into the rendering of such passages as Matt. vi. 13, vii. 19; Mark vii. 19; John x. 16, xiii. 10; Rom. iii. 25, xii. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 17; Gal. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 32; Phil. ii. 6; Col. ii. 23; Jas. ii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 26, iii. 16, iv. 14; Heb. i. 1; Jude 22, and many more? And in the Old Testament, is it not a gain of the highest kind to have got rid of the errors which obscured Exod. xxxiv. 33; Deut. xxxiii. 6; Isa. xviii. 2, xxi. 7, xxx. 7; Dan. vii. 9, and passage after passage of the Psalms of David? Let any one read the wholly unintelligible rendering of the Authorized Version in Isa. vi. 13 or ix. 1-5 (the lesson for Christmas Day), and observe the difference made by the correction of the old errors. The Revised Version, which prejudice has anathematized, and at which ignorance has jeered, will, I feel confident, be received by future generations as one of the best practical commentaries furnished by students of Scripture to the Church and to the world.

5. And recent exegetes have not been content with the accurate mastery of the sacred languages. They have felt that neither genius nor intuition can supply the lack of varied as well as solid learning. It is a curiously characteristic fact, that, whereas even the great Theodore of Mopsuestia not only never troubled himself to learn Hebrew, or even to consult the Peshito, two of our bishops—not to speak of other commentators—have not only learnt Syriac, but have even learnt *Aethiopic*, solely with the view of being able to appreciate the variations of reading suggested or confirmed by the *Aethiopic* versions. Nor have these researches been confined to language. The study of the Talmud involves that extreme difficulty which wrung a groan from the laborious Lightfoot. Yet in spite of his pathetic complaint of the obscurity and compression of Talmudic Hebrew, a few English scholars have of late years learned to read it in the original. For many years

commentators were mostly content to utilize the heterogeneous and miscellaneous collections of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Meuschen, Eisenmenger, Wagenseil, Surenhuys, and other foreign scholars. These have long been felt to be insufficient. It is now comparatively easy to obtain some knowledge of the "Sea of the Talmud" and of Talmudic writings, for within the last decade large parts of the Talmud have been translated into French by Mons. Schwab and his *collaborateurs*, and many passages have been rendered into English by Mr. P. J. Hershon. The Midrashim have been published in German by Wünsche, and the Masorah is being edited by Dr. Ginsburg. Few commentators would now be content to annotate a book of either the Old or New Testament without ascertaining, at least from secondary sources, the opinion of the Rabbis upon disputed passages. And the sources of information which must be taken into account multiply upon us. What modern interpreter could now adequately deal with any one of the historic books of the Old and New Testament without making himself acquainted with the recent identification of sites and archaeological discoveries which have been brought to light by explorations in Palestine, and Egypt, and beyond the Jordan? Who could dream of commenting upon the Pentateuch, the Prophets, Ezra, and Nehemiah, without acquainting himself with the labours of Egyptologists, and the facts which we have learnt from the exhumation and deciphering of ancient monuments? Who would think himself adequately equipped as an exponent of the Epistles without learning something at least of the general *data* of sacred thought among the nations as it has been examined in the light of comparative religion?

6. Again, the advantages of diligence, of wide learning, and of accurate scholarship might still be neutralized if our expositors were content with the servile following of traditional opinion and traditional methods. But it is one of

our elements of progress that they have learnt to exercise with fearless judgment a noble independence, in the conviction that nothing is so sacred as truth, and that "truth is invulnerable as the sunbeam." They have shown this sacred impartiality even when they are treating of burning questions. Silently they have abandoned the old mechanical views of inspiration which ignored the human element. Those views were borrowed from Greek philosophy through Philo. Montanism spread the belief in ecstatic inspiration, in which the faculties of the recipient were simply obliterated. No careful observer can miss the fresh and comparatively modern methods of treatment which, for the first time, have enabled us to understand the real value and significance of such books as Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. Where there are real difficulties to be met, as in the case of the composite character of the book of Genesis, the date of Daniel, the unity of Isaiah, the true significance of Jonah, and the relation of certain chapters in Ezekiel to one great section of the book of Leviticus, the reader will be sure to find in any good modern commentary the means of forming for himself a fair and unbiassed judgment. The question of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel is one of the deepest importance for Christian theology, yet in the latest and best commentary the arguments of those who impugn it are stated with perfect fairness, and instead of being met with futile denunciation are refuted with patient skill. Without in any way understating or slurring over the difficulties of those who reject the apostolic authorship of "the spiritual Gospel," recent exegesis has, by the closest and keenest analysis, proved that there is in its favour both external and internal evidence of unanswerable force. This patient and fearless confronting of adverse reasoning has been rewarded by the recent discovery of further external evidence which proves such important facts as the references to the fourth Gospel

by the early Basilidians, the use of it by Tatian in his *Diatessaron*, and the existence even as early as the second century of an established variation in the text.¹

Take again the questions which have arisen about the pastoral Epistles. The critics of the Tübingen school have put forth their whole strength to demonstrate the spuriousness of these Epistles. English scholarship has thoroughly tested their arguments, and while admitting the deficiency of historical confirmation for St. Paul's release from his first imprisonment, have shown by internal evidence alone the all but demonstrable certainty of that fact. Take, again, the very recent controversy about the Second Epistle of Peter. It has always been admitted that the evidences for the genuineness of that epistle were weaker than those for any other book of the New Testament, and that the weakness of external evidence was hardly compensated by the treatise itself, which abounds in formidable internal difficulties in its phraseology, its allusions, and its relation to the Epistle of St. Jude. These difficulties were immensely enhanced in every candid mind when Dr. Edwin Abbott called attention to the fact of startling resemblances between phrases of the epistle and two remarkable sections in the writings of Josephus. The question has not yet been threshed out. The opinions of some as to the complete genuineness—not of course as to the canonicity—of the Epistle have once more been seriously shaken; while others have embarked on ingenious if not finally convincing lines of defence. The fact however remains—and in this fact lies one of our best guarantees for the ultimate discovery of the truth—that the question has been discussed purely on its own merits, and without any reference to natural prejudice or ancient tradition. We have learnt to recognise, not only that Nature is a book of God, and

¹ John i. 18, *μονογενὴς Θεός*. See on this reading the masterly monograph of Dr. Hort, *Taco Dissertations*. (Camb., 1876.)

Science His exegete, but also that History is a book of God, and that it teaches the essential duty of progress. It is the nature of truth to broaden and brighten more and more to the perfect day. "Nor is it at all improbable," wrote Bishop Butler, "that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered." The western hemisphere was unknown for ages, and hence, as Goodwin infers, "well may it be conceived not only that some, but many truths, yea, and those of maine concernment and importance, may be yet unborne." "I am persuaded," said John Robinson to the departing Pilgrim Fathers, "that the Lord hath yet more truth and light to break forth from His holy word."

7. The unbiassed fairness which has thus dealt with entire books has been applied with results no less beneficial to special texts and paragraphs. No dread of outcry or abuse has prevented English scholars from stating, or English revisers from accepting, the force of overwhelming evidence in their treatment of such passages of the *Textus Receptus* as Jud. xviii. 30, Job xix. 23, Ps. viii. 5, Hag. ii. 7, Zech. xiii. 6, Mark xvi. 9–20, John viii. 1–11, 1 John v. 7; or in omitting the confession in Acts viii. 37 or Matt. xiii. 21, or the word *ηστεία* in Mark ix. 29, 1 Col. vii. 5. No multiplication of patristic or scholastic authority for an erroneous interpretation has prevented them from setting aside that meaning where it was obviously based on untenable principles. It is impossible to furnish lengthy proofs or illustrations in a brief and general paper, but I may instance three texts, which in past ages have been misinterpreted, to the fatal injury of exegesis itself. Origen, who was the practical inventor of the *triplex* (which was afterwards subdivided into the *quadruplex*) *intelligentia*, referred for confirmation to Prov. xxii. 22, where the doubtful reading יִשְׁלַח is rendered by the LXX. καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπογράψῃς αὐτὰ τρισσῶς, and in the Vulgate *Ecce descripsi*

tibi tripliciter. It would be difficult to find a parallel for a more amazingly impossible and exorbitantly expanded inference, founded on a more completely misinterpreted fragment of a text.

Again, Father after Father, Schoolman after Schoolman quotes and reiterates *ad nauseam* the fragment of a verse (2 Cor. iii. 6), “the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,” to maintain the necessity and duty of their so called “spiritual” interpretation. Yet no shadow of any such meaning is consistent with the context. The letter killeth *what?* The letter killeth *whom?* Is *all* literal interpretation supposed to be thus murderous? If so, how is it ever permissible? Some, at least, of our most recent commentators have seen the true meaning to be that “the law—the written enactment—judicially puts to death” (comp. Rom. viii. 8-13), whereas the Spirit quickeneth, or makes alive, because the Spirit raises us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. I turn, for instance, to Canon Evans, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and find the clear, decisive remark, “There is no justification whatever for the application (of ‘letter’) so often made, to literal as opposed to spiritual interpretation of the gospel.”

Again, in almost every age, and especially amid the furious debates of the post-Reformation epoch, one of the rules of interpretation was, that every one was to interpret “according to the proportion of faith” (Rom. xii. 6); and this mistranslation was further misinterpreted into an assertion that *analogia fidei* was the same thing as *analogia scripturæ*, while the *fides* was always identified with one of the endless formulae of the prevailing symbololatry. Alike the Greek and the usage of words absolutely forbid any such interpretation, and the Revised Version now correctly renders the phrase, “let us prophesy according to the proportion of *our* faith.” Here again I turn to the *Speaker's Commentary*,

and find that Archdeacon Gifford both gives the true explanation, "that the prophets should utter neither more nor less than the revelation received *by the measure of their faith*, without exaggeration, display, or self-seeking," and also a repudiation of the incessantly repeated errors: "the rule of faith," "the general analogy of revealed truth," and all similar renderings which make *faith* mean "that which is to be believed," are, he says, unsuited to the context, and otherwise untenable. Thus three erroneous, or at any rate immensely overstrained and misapplied, lines of exegesis, which have reigned for generations on the supposed authority of three isolated phrases, are set aside or greatly limited, alike by the scholarship and the exposition of living students.

8. Another reason for this advance is that now, more than at any previous period, it has become habitual with us to abandon the old *atomistic* method, which, in defiance of Scripture itself, treated Scripture as a congeries of separate supernatural utterances homogeneously inspired and spiritually equipollent. Every "text" of Scripture is now happily interpreted in relation to the book in which it occurs, and the entire passage of which it forms a part. The resultant gain has been incalculable. In every good modern commentary careful attention is now given to all that falls under the head of "introduction," which the ancient expositors have almost wholly neglected. It may be said with truth that subordinate and accidental minutiae sometimes receive a disproportionate attention, and that the "introduction" to a sacred book now gives us a mass of geographical and historical information which can hardly be regarded as essential, since it may have been quite unknown to and without any influence upon the sacred writer himself. Yet I will mention, by way of illustration, two books of capital importance, which for their true interpretation have largely depended upon

the circumstances under which they were written. One is the Epistle to the Galatians, the other is the Apocalypse. It is not too much to say, that if the Epistle to the Galatians comes home to us with all the incomparable force of its original meaning, this is largely due to the full knowledge which we now possess of the events which called it forth. It was always full of eternal lessons, yet much of its historic purpose was inevitably missed, when even such a thinker as St. Thomas Aquinas was content to work it into his scheme of the Pauline epistles as a sort of appendix to the treatment of grace as it is in the sacraments. On this subject all are now agreed. Such is not as yet the case with the Apocalypse. Many English exegetes, with that intense conservatism which has been a not wholly useless or dishonourable characteristic of English theology, still cling to what I cannot but hold to be the mistake of St. Irenaeus—or, at any rate, a mistaken apprehension of his meaning—as regards the date at which that book was written. I venture to think that another generation will have fully accepted its origin in the reign of Vespasian, and will have found the clue to many of its symbols in the events of the Neronian persecution and the epoch which immediately succeeded it. Those who have adopted this view are no longer confronted with the stupendous difficulty of believing, on most inadequate and disputable evidence, that the Apocalypse was written *after* the gospel and the first epistle. So then the book ceases to be a sphinx, propounding an insoluble enigma as she lies at the closing door of revelation. From being the most perplexing book of Scripture, the Apocalypse becomes to them, in its main outline, one of the easiest to understand, and the tumultuous power and grandeur of it come home to them with tenfold power, as they hear in it “the thundering reverberation of a mighty spirit struck with the plectrum of indignation,” when he had witnessed the

wild beast from the sea of nations rioting in the slaughter of the saints of God.

9. As a conspicuous example of the benefit which has resulted from what I may call the *contextual* study of Scripture by modern exegetes, I will point to another of St. John's writings, the first epistle, which is so deeply important as the epilogue and enforcement of the truths set forth in the gospel, and as being in all probability the last utterance of apostolic inspiration. Even by commentators of first-rate endowments, the style of St. John was long treated as a sort of *arena sine calce*. They were unable to understand its method, to estimate aright its abstract terms, or to unravel the difficulty of its causal connexions. Practically they treated it as though it were like the style of Seneca, which, in a lucid moment, the Emperor Caligula compared to the motions of a dancer, who recedes as often as he advances, and makes no real progress. Even Augustine has no more to say of this epistle than "Locuturus est multa, et prope omnia de caritate"; and Calvin had so little mastered its plan as to make the strangely inadequate remark, "Sparsim docendo et exhortando varius est." In this age, perhaps for the first time, thanks to the labours of such workers as Haupt and Professor Westcott, the fruitful hint originally given by Joachim Oporinus has been worked out. We are beginning to see that the indescribable charm of those "brief quivering sentences" is not purchased at the expense of the most rigid and logical cohesion. So far from being, as had been implied, one of the most loosely constructed books of Scripture, we can now see that it not only has a most definite and concentrated purpose, but that this purpose is worked out with consummate care and with the most distinct articulation of reasoning. Let any one read a number of commentaries on such a paragraph as 1 John i. 6-10. In none of them, down to very recent times, is any real attempt made to appreciate

the deep *distinctions* of meaning which lie in the three clauses—

Ver. 6 : “*If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in the darkness*”;

Ver. 8: “*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves*”;

Ver. 10 : “*If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar*”;

—with the clauses which follow them, and state the opposite conditions. Then let him turn to the best modern commentary, the result of many years of deep thought, and he will see in those clauses no aimless tautology, or mere varied reiteration, but the warning against three wholly different types of the falsity which causes men to ignore the reality of sin, to deceive themselves as to their responsibility for sin, and to proclaim their own personal immunity from sin, and so to miss the possibility of fellowship with God.

10. Again, we may be thankful to modern English exegesis for its decisive clearness. Bengel showed us the high advantage of lucid terseness over tedious prolixity. Down to very recent times there was a distinct danger that commentaries would degenerate into the *variorum* character, forming a chaos of untenable guesses, like *Poli Synopsis*, and many similar compilations, in which it is impossible to see the wood for the trees. Gratitude is due to the late Dean Alford for faithful labours, which gave a strong impulse to the study of the New Testament; but among his many merits every one must have felt the disadvantage which is caused by his incessant refutations of idle hypotheses which did not deserve to be perpetuated. There are said to be at least four hundred and thirty interpretations of Gal. iii. 20, of which at least four hundred and twenty-nine must be more or less wrong, and of which all but two or three may be entirely swept aside and left to oblivion. The passage is not insoluble, and when studied with its

entire context can scarcely even be regarded as one of special difficulty. In the English commentaries which will at once occur to every student as the best, the one interpretation now generally regarded as final is given without any ambiguity, and we are not put off with the irritating *vel aliter* or *aliter dici potest*, which so constantly meet us in the comments of earlier days. The late learned Bishop of Lincoln—whom all men honoured, but whose commentaries, apart from their classical learning and incidental merits, belong to the past rather than to the present stage of exegesis—quoted a passage from an English divine expressive of his own predilection for the style of exposition which sometimes gave two or more good, but mutually exclusive, meanings to the same text, provided only that they tended to edification. Such a method might be admissible, if we suppose that the sacred writers expressed themselves in constant *amphibologiae*. But unless we reject the most wise and suggestive maxim of the Rabbis, that “the law speaks in the tongue of the sons of men,” we may assume that prophets and apostles wrote, like all other human beings, with the desire to be understood, and understood in one distinct sense. Their words indeed may admit of rich and many-sided *applications*; they may have a wide-reaching significance; in this respect, as in all others, they may far surpass the utterances of man’s unenlightened genius: it is nevertheless certain from the nature of things that their words must have had one clear meaning for their contemporaries; and it is (I repeat) the duty of the interpreter to find out, and to the best of his power to set forth, first of all, the one plain, primary, literal, historical, contextual meaning which the writer intended to convey to his immediate readers. This is what the reader expects of the commentator; and when he has discharged this duty he may extravagate as much as he thinks desirable. But exegesis is one thing, and inferential theology, with “its

ever widening spiral *ergo*," is quite another. We may well rejoice that this truth is now fully recognised.

11. I will mention but one more characteristic of modern English exegesis; namely, its width of range, and the interest of its literary and other illustrations. Some of our best commentaries thus become so brightly human and attractive, that they allure thousands of unaccustomed students to study for themselves the word of God. In such books, for instance, as those of the Bishop of Durham on the Epistles, the incidental lights are numberless, and there is not a relevant point of language, history, or archaeology which does not receive a treatment as exhaustive in its way as that given to questions of theology. Or if we turn to the commentaries written by the Bishop of Derry and Dean Plumptre, we find them constantly brightened by illustrations from the entire range of modern literature, in prose and verse. If the labours of Wettstein derive additional value from the many parallels which he was the first to adduce from the stores of classical literature, there is no reason why the thoughts and allusions of the sacred writers should not with due moderation and strict relevancy be illustrated by "the thoughts that breathe and words that burn" in the great works of modern thinkers. Provided that the license be not extravagantly assumed, we may say—

"From art, from nature, from the schools,
Let random influences glance,
Like light in many a shivered lance
That breaks about the dappled pools."

Other and better qualified writers will, as I have already said, present to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR a more special and detailed examination of the merits and, if need be, the defects of particular exegetes. But if I have been justified in maintaining that our best modern specimens of interpretation have been thus characterized by directness of aim,

terseness, attention to the text, accurate scholarship, the removal of ancient errors of translation, varied learning, independent judgment, the study of the context, the study of books in their entirety, decisive clearness, and attractive interest, then we may say, with thankfulness and a sense of encouragement, that an age which has been so prolific of discoveries in all other branches of science has not been untrue to its opportunities and obligations in the domain of scriptural interpretation.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE USE OF MYTHIC PHRASES BY THE OLD TESTAMENT WRITERS.

I. ON Ps. xxii. 3.

In the present series of *THE EXPOSITOR* (vol. i., p. 319, cf. p. 400) I have endorsed the once heretical theory that the Old Testament writers love to pick the wayside flowers of popular mythic imagery; and truly Delitzsch,¹ no less than Kuennen, has cordially acknowledged this to be a proved fact. The servants of the highest Truth may have so interwoven these earthly growths with blooms of another clime that for a long time they were unrecognised by the common eye, but now that our sight has been strengthened by the criticism of other literatures, we should be dull indeed to disregard them, and now that our conception of providential guidance has been widened, we should be equally dull to be offended at them. “We are not distressed”—it

¹ See many passages in Delitzsch's *Psalms* and *Genesis* (see e.g. notes on Gen. i. 10 and vi. 2 in new edition); also the article, “Are there Myths in the Holy Scriptures?” by Dr. Franz Delitzsch, in *The Independent*, New York, Aug. 20th, 1885.

is the reassuring remark of Cardinal Newman—"to be told that the doctrine of the angelic host came from Babylon, while we know that they did sing at the Nativity; nor that the vision of the Mediator is in Philo, if in very deed He died for us on Calvary."¹

The Cardinal (if we may antedate his assumption of dignity) is obviously unprepared to examine the evidence for the former statement; possibly beneath his tolerance there lurks a slight suspicion of contempt for criticism. As to the Cherubim, however (not really angels, I admit, but certainly superhuman beings), the Babylonian affinities of the conception are unquestionable. (It is not necessarily on this account—see below—to be relegated to the Captivity.) Whether or not *kirubu* is a name for the colossal divine figure which guarded the entrance to a Babylonian temple,² one side of the conception confessedly finds its analogue in the "throne-bearers" (*guzalāni*) spoken of in the Babylonian Flood-story and elsewhere. Just as the presence of Mul-lil, the supreme god of Nipur, was mediated by his "throne-bearer,"³ so that of the true El Elyōn ("God most high") was mediated by the Cherubim; the old mythic word was retained by the sacred writers as an acceptable symbol. Now let us notice how the familiar divine title "that dwelleth upon the cherubim," is spiritualized by the psalmists. Properly speaking, it describes Jehovah as the absolute master of the forces (especially the more awful forces) of the universe. But the sacred poets know that Jehovah is not only El Shaddai (a God of destructive power, cf. Isa. xiii. 6), but a God of lovingkindness,—read the lovely words of Ps. lxii. 11, 12. He is not fully revealed by awful deeds of judgment; there are two Cherubim, and their names are "righteousness and judgment" (Ps. xevii. 2).

¹ *Essays*, ii. 233 (*Milman's View of Christianity*).

² *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Jan., 1886; *Expositor*, vol. i, p. 400.

³ Sayee, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 145, 154.

Now the most important side of God's "righteousness" (*i.e.* fidelity to His revealed principles of action) has a name of its own—"lovingkindness," and the Divine love calls forth the responsive love of His people. Consequently Jehovah's "throne-bearers" ultimately become the loving praises of His people. "But thou," says the Psalmist, "art the Holy One, enthroned upon the praises of Israel" (Ps. xxii. 3). With which we should compare Ps. viii. 2, "With the mouth of children and sucklings (*i.e.* with the thanksgivings of childlike believers) thou hast founded strength (*i.e.* a stronghold), to still the enemy and the revengeful."

II. ON ISA. XXIX. 1, 2; PS. XLVIII. 2; ISA. XXXIII. 7.

We have seen that the "cherubim" have Assyrio-Babylonian affinities. If so, must not the "mountain of Elohim" (Ezek. xxviii. 14)—the original of the mountain of Purgatory and of the earthly Paradise in Dante—be related to the same system of mythology? Lenormant and Friedrich Delitzsch have sufficiently proved that it must. At this point two fresh questions arise, to which, however difficult, an answer has to be sought. First, does the Old Testament contain the Babylonian name of the vast "mountain of the countries" (Arālū) on whose summit the divine beings dwell? and next, how early can such references to this mountain be traced?

Lenormant thought (*Les origines de l'histoire*, ii. 1, p. 136) that "the land of Havilah where there is gold" (Gen. ii. 11) might, in the mind of the original narrator, be "the land of Harālāh," *i.e.* of that very mountain Arālū of which we are in quest, and which the Babylonians believed to be rich in gold (cf. Sayce, *Academy*, Jan. 28th, 1882, p. 64; *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 360). But granting the possibility of the corruption of הַוְלָה into חֲרֵלָה, why the feminine termination? A purely Hebrew explanation of Havilah (a

name of no uncommon occurrence) as “sand-land,”¹ is certainly more plausible. Jeremias however has lately found traces, he thinks, of the name Aralû elsewhere (*Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, 1887, p. 121, etc.). One of his instances is from the prophet of the Exile referred to above. In Ezek. xlvi. 15, 16, we find אַרְיָאֵל, **הַרְאֵל**, or אַרְיָאֵל (all these readings occur—the Septuagint has ἄριελ) as a designation of the altar-hearth in Ezekiel’s ideal sketch of the restored temple of Jerusalem. Now, just as Mount Zion is (since Jehovah’s removal from Sinai, Ps. lxviii. 17) a kind of earthly symbol of the invisible “mountain of Elohim” (“heav’n’s high steep,” in Milton’s phrase), so, according to Jeremias, the altar was a symbol in miniature of the terrestrial Aralû—mount Zion; or why not say at once, a lesser symbol of the true Aralû? That the name was given to the altar-hearths of other “high places” (cf. Mesha’s inscription, lines 12, 17)² did not hinder Ezekiel from using it of the one altar which he could regard as legitimate. Jeremias naturally goes a step further, and regards the puzzling “Ariel” in Isa. xxix. 1, 2, which the Targum translates “altar” (Sept. has ἄριελ), as miswritten for Aral (אַרְיָאֵל for אַרְלָאֵל; cf. דָוִיָּג for דָאָג, 1 Sam. xxii. 18 k’thib). Zion is, ideally, “the mount in which God has desired to dwell” (Ps. lxviii. 16); in short, a “mountain of Elohim” more truly, though *at present* (cf. Isa. ii. 2) less visibly, than mountains like those of Bashan (*ib.* 15); Zion is a true symbol of Aralû—is Aralû. Yet Jehovah, says the prophet, will afflict this Aralû or (dropping the case-ending) Aral, so that it shall be like that melancholy world of the shades (see v. 4) which the Babylonians placed in the inmost recesses of the great Mountain, and which equally bore the

¹ So Delitzsch, in the new edition of his *Genesis*; and so Spurrell in his useful volume of *Notes* (Oxford, 1887).

² Jeremias does not refer to this; probably he doubts the reading.

name Arâlû.¹ I can see no insuperable objection to this attractive view, and think that none of the rival theories are as satisfactory.

Again a question suggests itself. Just as the false Arâlû (false, from a prophetic point of view) is referred to once (Isa. xiv. 13; see below²) without being named, is there any passage in which the true Arâlû is described in phrases of mythic origin? May we appeal to Ps. xlvi. 2? It certainly looks as if the phrase "the recesses of the north" were a synonym for "mount Zion" (the symbolic earthly Arâlû), just as "in the mount of assembly" (A.V. and R.V. "of congregation") is parallel to "in the recesses (R.V. "uttermost parts") of the north," in Isa. xiv. 13. This is not satisfactory however; what appropriateness has such a phrase in an eulogy either of Jerusalem as a whole or of mount Zion? The former was popularly regarded as "umbilicus terræ" (Ezek. xxxviii. 12, Vulg. and R.V. marg.; cf. v. 5); the latter was more probably on the east than on the north side of the city. Besides, do we not require "in the recesses of the north"?—an accusative of place is hardly natural between two nominatives. What then are we to say of the phrase? Can it be genuine? The verse is complete enough without it. May not a scribe have noted down in the margin of his manuscript two catchwords from a passage in Isaiah (xiv. 13), which seemed to him to be parallel to Ps. xlvi. 2,—catchwords which afterwards, as in other instances, found their way into the text?

The last passage I have to quote is Isa. xxxiii. 7, "Behold, אַרְאָלִים (v. 1.) cry without; the messengers

¹ On Arâlû (or Arallû), cf. (besides Jerenias' book) Friedr. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 120, etc.; Sayee, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 358, etc., etc.

² A.V. renders "the mount of the congregation," assuming, on the analogy of אַהֲרֹן כִּיּוֹצֵר (misrendered "the tabernacle of the congregation") that the phrase referred to the "sanctuary of Jehovah." So even Bishop Lowth. This confounds the mythic Babylonian and the symbolic Israelitish Arâlû.

of peace weep bitterly." Two things seem at a glance reasonably probable: (1) that אַרְאֵל (separating the noun from the termination) should be explained in accordance with Isa. xxix. 1, 2; and (2) that the termination is that which marks the plural. Rashi noticed the first point; he connects this verse with verse 10, and explains, "Behold, for the altar which belonged to them long have they cried and lamented." Among the moderns, I take a pleasure in mentioning Henderson (in general, a perfectly useless guide), who renders, ingeniously enough, "Behold, their Ariel [*i.e.* their boasted holy city]! they raise a cry without," etc. The second point was overlooked by the Targum and the other ancient versions (except the Vulgate, which guesses "videntes"), but noticed with his usual acuteness by Bishop Lowth, who gives, "Behold, the mighty men raise a grievous cry." It would make a better parallelism, if we might render, "Behold, the envoys cry without"; both Kimchi and Ibn Ezra favour this view, but there is no other authority for this sense of אַרְאֵל, and it has been generally held that the Jewish expositors who follow these rabbis have been biassed by the Talmudic use of אַרְאֵלִים for a class of angels (see *e.g.* the striking passage on the death of Jehudah the Holy, cited by Buxtorf from *Kethuboth*, 104 a, where, followed by Wünsche, he renders the word "prævalidi").¹ But current Jewish names of the classes of angels are obviously derived from the Scriptures (see the Jewish liturgies). In spite of this, Kohut and Kalisch both interpret אַרְאֵלָם "of the angels,"² and the view appears to be correct. The Arēlim are in fact the "messengers of peace," who, as Kalisch says, "feel pity and compassion, and weep bitterly at the sight of desolation and human misery," and

¹ Levy and Jastrow simply render "angels." The etymology in Jastrow's Lexicon needs no serious refutation.

² Kohut, *Jüdische Angelologie*, p. 8 (cf. note 14, p. 286); Kalisch, *Leviticus*, ii. 285.

who are opposed to the “angels of death” (*Prov. xvi. 14*). The philological basis may till now have been deficient, but Jeremias seems to have supplied it. The Arēlīm, or rather Arālīm are the inhabitants of Aralū, sent forth on friendly messages to Jehovah’s land. They are not indeed the angels of the Christian imagination; but neither are they the titan-like Seraphim spoken of in *Isa. vi.*; they are perhaps a link between the two. Nowhere else, it is true, in the Old Testament at least (contrast *Luke xv. 7, 10*), are the Divine messengers said to have human emotions; and an Israelite would not understand the question, “Pourquoi n’y aurait-il pas dans le paradis des pleurs, tels que les saints peuvent en répandre?”¹ But if Isaiah referred to these friendly beings (the predecessors of Gabriel and Raphael) at all, why should he not have frankly humanized them? If Jehovah was “pitiful at the sound of Israel’s cry” (*Isa. xxx. 19*), why should not His messenger have translated this pity into tears? Observe that the Seraphim, like the Aralim (on the present hypothesis), are only once referred to, and that in Isaiah. There is therefore absolutely no inducement to suppose the verse to be an interpolation, even if (see *Prophecies of Isaiah*, i. 189) we conjecture that chap. xxxiii. was worked up for publication by a disciple of the prophet. It is true that, according to the Talmud, “the names of the angels came up with the Jews from Babylon” (Kalisch, *Leviticus*, ii. 288); but obviously the superhuman beings must have had some class-names before. Assyrio-Babylonian in their affinities, Arāl and Arālīm, not less than Cherubim, may be; but, as Prof. Sayce has lately remarked (*Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 41–43), the Israelites must have had intercourse with Assyria and Babylonia long before the Babylonian Exile.

¹ *Génie du christianisme*, ii. 295 (Paris, 1802).

III. ON ISA. xiv. 12, 13.

It is not unnatural to turn back a few pages in the prophetic volume, and pause at another passage which alludes, though not by name, to Aralù,—I mean that splendid Ode on the fall of the king of Babylon, which has not only coloured several passages in the New Testament (in Matt. xi. 23, Luke x. 18, Rev. viii. 10, ix. 1), but impressed both Milton and our own truly Biblical poet, the Bishop of Derry. Not that Milton and Alexander are the only ones of whom this can be said. There are also poets without the gift of song; at least, there are moments which make poets of us all. Thus, when in 1807, the year of Germany's humiliation, the University of Halle was closed, the great Hebraist Gesenius had to suspend his lectures at Isa. xiv. 11. Soon however the tide of fortune turned, and the university was reopened, and Gesenius began his lectures by reading aloud, “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!”¹ The author of the Ode was himself a great poet; he was also as true to Babylonian sentiment as was the writer of Nebuchadnezzar’s speech in Dan. iv. 30. Only we are accustomed to exaggerate the offence of the king in the Ode. He was not consciously overstepping the bounds of possibility; we must not compare his boast with the stories of Titans scaling the heavens. We have long known that the Egyptians, and, with less exaggeration, the Assyrians, regarded their kings as representatives of the Divine. I have ventured to remark, in commenting on this Ode, that “it was but rational to take the next step and admit these semi-divine beings to a share in the family life of their celestial parents.” I added however that the evidence for this as a fact was still imperfect. Theocritus, no doubt, says (xvii. 15, 16,

¹ I retain A.V.’s exquisite hexameter, referring to THE EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1887, pp. 451, 452.

Lang), “Him (Philadelphus) hath the Father stablished in the same honour as the blessed immortals, and for him a golden mansion in the house of Zeus is builded”—an old Egyptian idea, one cannot doubt. An Assyrian royal psalm, translated by Schrader and Sayce, points to a similar conception in Assyria, and now Jeremias has enabled me to give fresh evidences. Tiglath-Pileser is the witness who, in the Prism-inscription, expressly speaks of his “family” (?) as called to “a mansion on the mount of the gods for ever.” (This too explains the sense of what some have called the hyperbole of the wish, “O king, live for ever.”) Remember too that the king has just been spoken of as the “shining one, son of the dawn” (Isa. xiv. 12). He identifies himself with the star-spirit (cf. Isa. xxiv. 21) who has jurisdiction over the empire of Babylon, and who is in a mystic manner connected with himself. What more natural than that he should look forward to entering the “land of the silver sky,”¹ where his predecessors shone for ever with a reflected divine lustre? One thing indeed was more natural (in the sense in which what is most divine is in the highest sense natural)—that Jehovah of hosts should interpose, and hurl down to Sheól (to the Arálù of the shades) him whose utterly selfish ambition imperilled the execution of God’s all-wise purposes for Israel his “servant.” Babylon had done its part—had unconsciously ministered to the purification of Israel—had even facilitated the emergence of some great ideas on the spiritual horizon of its captives, and then—was to be cast down as a hindrance to the future work of Providence.

Let us not despise these primitive conceptions, which in fact have all been used by holy men of God in early stages of the true religion. Each one of these myths has coloured

¹ The phrase in the royal psalm mentioned above. “Silver” is an epithet descriptive of the intense brilliance of the sunlight in the upper regions. Comp. Goldziber, *Der Mythos bei den Hebräern*, p. 179.

the symbolic language of Christendom. We need no literal "mountain of Elohim," but the Christian heart has still its Arâlû; and since the Church is a "*royal priesthood*," each member thereof may in a true sense adopt the language even of the king of Babylon. Our angelic visitants have indeed no material heights to descend, and when we dream, it is of no ladder like Jacob's; and yet whenever the Christian poet speaks of heaven and of angels, he involuntarily uses the imaginative material inherited from the days when the world was young. We do not think of our God as "riding upon a cherub" (Ps. xviii. 10), but we do know that He delights to honour the prayers and praises of His servants, and that, like the Cherubim, these Spirit-taught utterances of the heart can at any moment bring Him nigh. He is "enthroned upon" those "cherubim" which are "the praises of Israel" (Ps. xxii. 3).

T. K. CHEYNE.

PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE last quarter of a century has witnessed the rise and growth of an intensely ardent intellectual activity in the theological halls of Scotland. It is, of course, but part of that larger movement of spiritual revival which is manifesting itself everywhere over Christendom, and in nothing more characteristically than in the novel and widespread interest that is shown in questions of a theological and apologetical character. But in the North this mental awakening takes on a peculiar complexion and significance from the past history and natural character of the people. It appears in a race, whose whole thought has for generations been saturated through and through with metaphysical speculation, and whose daily life has to an

almost unique degree been fashioned in religious forms and channels. There, as nowhere else, the experimental trial of the modern reconstruction of Christianity may be made on the broadest scale, in the most practical fashion, and under the most favourable conditions to determine whether the new theology is compatible or incompatible with a deep, warm, and living Christian faith and practice.

The Scotch colleges of divinity are remarkable, alike for their number in so small a country and for the completeness of their equipment. True, they do not possess those positions of affluent and leisurely learning, which secure for the Church of England that regular succession of illustrious scholars and theologians of which she is justly proud. But for the production of a uniformly cultured and thoroughly trained clergy, we question if any country, except Germany, possesses a machinery and curriculum quite equal to the great theological schools of Scotland. Among them the New College, Edinburgh, holds a position second to none, whether for the number of its *alumni* or the perfection of its organization. Every year it puts some forty preachers into the pulpits and mission-fields of the Free Church, besides extending the hospitality of its class-rooms to students from every country of Europe, from America and the Colonies, and frequently from lands and races more foreign and remote.

Beginning with Dr. Chalmers, the New College has had and still has in its chairs teachers of world-wide eminence. Its influence in forming the ministry of its own and other Churches cannot but be very great. Among the various and valuable elements that go to make up that influence, we doubt if any is more potent than that emanating from the present occupant of the chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis. Professor Davidson is not an ecclesiastical statesman or popular leader. He takes no part in the proceedings of Church courts, nor does he intervene in political

or social movements. He confines himself absolutely to teaching the Old Testament to his students. Other personages and principles bulk more largely and prominently on the stage of contemporary affairs, both in matters of Church and of State. Nevertheless it is the opinion of many, that in the Hebrew classroom of the New College there is in operation an influence of the very first magnitude, in the work of shaping the theological and religious future of Scotland. For outsiders it is not quite easy to understand how that may be. Dr. Davidson is known to be an erudite Orientalist, one of the very foremost among living Exegetes, and he is besides a skilful and successful teacher. His work on the *Hebrew Accents* was authoritative when it appeared, though now superseded by later researches. His *Introductory Hebrew Grammar* is a model of clearness, condensation, and felicity in combining scientific delineation with practical serviceableness, and it has justly been adopted as textbook in a majority of the English-speaking schools of Hebrew. An early work, dealing with the problem of Job, was marked by rare brilliancy and dramatic power of presentation, but it remained unfinished, and is now out of print. Since then we have had from his pen a number of able articles and criticisms in magazines, and within the last few years a couple of handbook commentaries on *Hebrews* and *Job*. These volumes are packed full of solid exegesis, sound scholarship, and suggestive thought, but their golden treasures are put forth in such an unpretentious fashion, as almost to make us believe that the author wished to take precautions against notoriety. Where other men would have published a portentous volume, and blown a trumpet, our author has slipped out his good things by stealth, and has done his best to conceal his light under a bushel of diffidence and modesty. The same thing is true of him in everything else that he does. As a preacher he might command the rapt attention

and sway the souls of multitudes ; but he has been chary of preaching at all, and when he does he selects inaccessible and thinly tenanted churches, as though it were his pre-destined *rôle* to be the voice of one crying in the wilderness. As a teacher he possesses a power of domination, that might create echoes of himself in his pupils almost wholesale, but he deliberately abjures the tempting ambition to form a school, and limits his action on his scholars to the less flattering task of stimulating and developing their own faith and thought and character. What then is the secret of his profound and far-reaching influence ? Wherein resides the virtue that goes out of him ? Manifestly it is not in the mere matter and manner of his teaching. Nor is it in the vastness of his erudition, nor in his public position, nor in the pressure of individual dogmatism, nor in the tyranny of an assertive will, nor indeed in any external work or action, nor in any single element of character. His singular and significant influence does not consist in what he does, but in what he is. It is not the quantity or the contents, but the quality and the kind of the thinking. It is not even the thought so much as the mind that secretes it. It is not its clearness nor its profundity, not its reserve nor its passion, not its scepticism nor its intensity of spiritual faith ; but it is the combination of all these, and the strange, subtle, and fascinating outcome of them. The central and sovereign spring of Dr. Davidson's unique influence in the literature, scholarship, and ministry of the Church is his personality.

The truth of this statement will be recognised even by those who know him only through his writings. Beneath the wording, that on first acquaintance has an appearance of coldness and hardness, readers speedily become conscious of a moral heat and tension, that stir the chords of thought and feeling in them to an unwonted extent, and produce—as few works of learning do—the impression of vital contact

with the glow and vibration of a living intellect. Those who have the good fortune to be acquainted with him in the pulpit, are still more sensible of this potent influence, which escapes from the preacher and inhabits his utterance. But, in its full breadth of compass and entralling power, the spell of the Professor's personality is known, we imagine, only to those who have passed through his class-room, and perceive in after years how profoundly its magic atmosphere has permeated their thought, kindled their enthusiasm, braced their faith, and determined the shape and direction of their spiritual growth and development.

It is especially in the lectures on exegesis and Biblical theology, that the creative genius of the Hebrew class-room resides and finds expression. Very memorable is the first impression of these lectures on the minds of generation after generation of students. They come up, these young men, as a rule from religious homes, with a warm-hearted zeal for the salvation of souls, with very definite doctrinal notions and dogmatic prejudices, and with that ingrained certainty of the infallibility of the parental creed, which is the unavoidable shadow of an earnest, genuine, and unlearned piety. They take their seats in the college class room, and in the silence of set attention the Professor begins his lecture. The subject is some Messianic psalm or prophecy with a fixed and well-known traditional interpretation, or some venerable and unquestioned statement of doctrine. With measured movement and slow precision the speaker begins to collect the elements, to trace the outlines, and to erect over us the customary habitation of our thought, to our infinite satisfaction and content. Presently there is a change of voice and manner. With sharper intonation and swifter utterance, but equally without haste and without hesitation, he proceeds to subject the structure to practical use and service. Suddenly we wake up to discover how narrow and contracted are its dimensions, how clumsy and

awkward are its communications, how artificial and unstable its construction, and how dark, dismal, and forbidding its atmosphere. The perception is a shock, but irresistible. The disenchanter, though so trenchant and effective, is calm and dispassionate. The defects of the edifice are manifestly not his invention, but simply his discovery. He now advances to more serious measures. The fabric is assailed with a stream of suggestions, subtle and disintegrating as a chemical solvent. In quick succession he discharges searching questions, that pierce through the arguments of defence, like cloth-yard arrows. These are followed by reasonings compact and massive, that fall on the walls like blows of a battering ram. The ancestral mansion of our faith trembles to its foundation, the battlements topple and tumble, the walls one by one fall in, and the whole edifice crumbles into ruin. The first impression was one of unmitigated disaster and homeless destitution. But, presently, when the dust cleared away and our eyes could see truly, we discovered that it was not ruin but emancipation. It was not disinheritance but disimprisonment. We had been set at liberty from a dark dungeon, and found ourselves out on God's broad, green earth, with the free air of heaven about us, and the blue sky over us. Looking back on such experiences, surely we may be forgiven for seeing through a halo of grateful admiration, scarce intelligible to others, the man who brought us out of the pit of ignorance, and the miry clay of prejudice, and set our feet upon a rock, and established our goings.

The Professor's style and delivery are strongly characteristic. His vocabulary is limited, choice rather than copious, but always forcible and expressive. He has the happy knack of planting in the point of a sentence precisely the word that is the pat and perfect embodiment of his idea. Without the cumbrous machinery of elaborate illustration, his expositions are everywhere lit up with suggestively

coined phrases, that have all the pictorial effect of set simile and metaphor. His thought is clothed in language of limpid clearness, and set forth with sharp-cut precision. The style is lithe and sinewy, moving with the supple ease of a living creature. In structure it is at once strong and subtle. It has the elasticity and toughness of steel. Grace and polish are never sought as mere artistic effects. Perchance they are sometimes unduly scorned. But the very fineness and truth of the thinking, not infrequently, compel the speech involuntarily to glow into beauty, and melt into poetry. It is characteristic of their author to hurry over such passages, as though he had been guilty of a weakness, and were ashamed of it. The delivery is quiet, composed, almost nonchalant. But within the cold, calm exterior there is hidden heat and fire. The pace is slow and steady, but each sentence falls with the measured force of a hammer stroke. That reserved manner is the disguise, that covers intense but restrained impetuosity. The energy of the speaker is not expended in voice or gesture, but is concentrated in the essential feeling, thought, and purpose of his theme. The dynamic force is latent in the lecturer, and so remains potential in his hearers. He does not burn away his gunpowder in useless noise, dazzling the eyes of his audience for a moment with rhetorical fireworks, and leaving them and his subject spent. He puts the gunpowder into his students, which has indeed on occasion resulted in explosions, but for the most part has been expended in regular service. And, perchance, the explosions have had their use in clearing the air, and, like thunderstorms, have left a purer and sweeter and more transparent atmosphere behind them.

A lecture by Dr. Davidson or a passage from his writings furnishes an imitable lesson in the art of intellectual analysis. It is like an anatomical demonstration by an

expert dissector. With unerring accuracy his eye detects the finest lines and angles of his subject. With light touch and swift movement, his lancet passes along the edges, and glides round the curves of the complex structure. Without exertion, as it were of itself, it parts asunder, and breaks up into its component elements. Flake falls from flake, section from section, each perfect, smooth, and uninjured, like the petals of a dismembered flower. The operator has hit the lines of cleavage, and severed the joints and articulations with infallible precision. It looks like the achievement of instinct rather than of skill, of intuition or divination rather than of reasoning. There is about it such a freedom from the appearance of strain or effort, and such an air of ease and certainty and perfection. But it is simply the work of a perception naturally penetrating, and an intellect keen-edged as a razor, that have been trained in the strictest school of honest investigation and unwearying practice and experience. This instantly becomes apparent, as the teacher takes up in turn each of the divided fragments, and shows its relative size and shape, its fittings and connexions, its nature and function, and its corporate value and significance. Bit by bit he reconstructs the organism before our eyes, restores it to its place, sets it in action in our sight, and explains how that operation is the result and outcome of the marvellous mechanism we have been privileged to behold. Nor does he stop there. He tells us the history of its first inception, its infancy, its growth and maturity, its analogues and affinities, its relations and organic place in the universal order of things. The secret of its nascence, the mystery of its life, the enigma of its ultimate causation are left, as these things ever must be, unexplained. But we know that it was born from above. The story of its natural history is told so that at every step it glows with the glory of its supernatural origin. We do not, indeed, see the Spirit, but we hear the

sound of it. And it is the Spirit—the Spirit of the living God.

It is in the realm of Biblical theology that Professor Davidson's rare faculty of analysis and construction is to be seen at its best. Those who have watched the minuteness of his dissection, the subtlety of his definition, and the deftness of his manipulation, will understand why the description borrowed inevitably the imagery of physical science. The exactness of the parallel springs from the intensely realistic character of the operator's mind. His thinking is never worked out in words and axioms and phrases—a sort of mental algebra that is far from uncommon. By an irresistible necessity his thought pierces through the symbols and formulas, till it reaches the realities they represent, and plays directly on the things themselves. His attitude to the technical terms of theology is significant. He has an inveterate distrust of the itinerant words and vagrant phrases that make up the every-day commonplace of popular religion. He treats them as a magistrate does suspicious characters. They are haled before him summarily, and required to give an account of themselves. Testimonials of character even from influential persons are not enough. He will not let them go at large, unless they can prove themselves in possession of the means of a legitimate subsistence. He knows how many phrases, once reputable and useful, have degenerated into worthlessness, so that their ancient and deserved credentials have become the instruments of imposture. He knows how much counterfeit coin, in the commerce of thought, passes from hand to hand unthinkingly, and performs the functions of honest currency. Therefore he will not admit into his reasoning any formula however august, nor any phrase however respectable, till he has tested and proved them. He rings each coin to see that it is genuine, and weighs it in the balance to make sure that it contains its

due value of solid meaning. It is not well to try and deceive him. When he asks for bread, it is dangerous to put him off with a stone, for he has a vigorous arm and an accurate aim. Dealing with learned pretences, he has been known to describe them by a word that is not always confined to things. Of innocent ignorance he is tolerant enough, but shallowness and superficiality in high places he cannot abide. Artificial distinctions, that exist in words only and do not exist in fact, imposing statements that move in the air but never touch reality, high-sounding explanations that are not worth the paper on which they are printed, are his abhorrence. A theory that substitutes formulas for facts, metaphors for realities, the robes and vesture of truth for truth herself, rouses him to resentment; and it is curious to watch the slow deliberation and cruel playfulness with which he proceeds to demolish it, almost as a cat destroys a mouse. It is, however, not vindictive spleen but righteous indignation. For he remembers Mephistopheles' definition of theology,¹ and it is a work of the arch-enemy that he annihilates. Moreover the measure he metes out to others he applies to himself as well, and with still sterner severity. His theology is never a theology of words; his reasoning is never empty verbiage; his sentences carry each its full tale of significance; he never steals lazily along the easy pathway of rhetoric, but plods

¹ “*Meph.* Am besten ist's auch hier, wenn ihr nur Einen hört,
Und auf des Meister's Worte schwört.
Im ganzen—haltet euch an Worte!
Dann geht ihr durch die siehre Pforte
Zum Tempel der Gewissheit ein.

Schüler. Doch ein Begriff muss bei dem Worte sein.

Meph. Schon gut! Nur muss man sich nicht allzu ängstlich quälen,
Denn eben, wo Begriffe fehlen,
Da stellt ein Wort zur rechten Zeit sich ein.
Mit Worten lässt sich trefflich streiten,
Mit Worten ein System bereiten,
An Worte lässt sich trefflich glauben,
Von einem Wort lässt sich kein Iota rauben.”—*Faust.*

along the rough and thorny pathway of reality. Is it not, indeed, a too scrupulous dread of unreality, that underlies his shy reluctance to admit into his thought even sentiment that is true, and poetry that is genuine?

Closely allied with the realism of his thinking is another attribute, that stands out in strong relief in everything that emanates from his pen. It is the singular absence of dogmatism, alike in his statements of fact, and the inferences he draws from them. Professor Davidson is one of those men, who make on others the impression that their personality is greater than their performances. We feel that he might be capable of anything—with two exceptions. He could not be a dictator in actual life, nor a dogmatist in theology. The entire bent of his temperament, mind, and will is against positivism of personal assertion. He takes up a question dispassionately, lays his mind open to opposing considerations, works along all paths, surveys the entire field of observation with comprehensive gaze and impartial scrutiny. He prosecutes the investigation broadly and tentatively; he asks questions and traces out probabilities; he weighs evidence and balances alternatives; he rejects no testimony however trivial and forecloses no probability however faint. Even when he proceeds to communicate to others the result of his researches, he is still studiously just and temperate in his declarations. He puts nothing certainly that is only likely, and he is careful to note objections as well as arguments. He is not an attorney making out his case, but rather a judge summing up for a verdict. For his students we count this quality to be of great value. In one way, no doubt, the immediate impression is less, but the ultimate effect is immeasurably greater. He has not the triumph of the orator, who sweeps his auditors away on the torrent of his own conviction, nor have his pupils the ready-made and serviceable, though of necessity one-sided and second-hand, opinion of their teacher stamped

upon their mind and stereotyped, to the exclusion of wider views and independent thinking. But the method of Dr. Davidson possesses advantages, that outweigh all temporary gains, secured at so heavy a loss. He compels his pupils to face the whole truth with its difficulties and contradictions, its lights and shadows, its certainties and uncertainties. They have seen and felt the forces that are at work weaving out the solution. The active interest and energy of their own thought have been stirred, and entangled into the strain and struggle of the problem. And precisely because they have got no quite complete and satisfactory solution, they set to to grapple with the problem for themselves, to scale its heights and sound its depths, and to achieve a conviction which shall be their own and not another's. This pedagogic benefit may be partly intentional, but mainly it springs from personal idiosyncracy. The perceptions of Dr. Davidson's mind are fine and universal. His sense of the balance of contending forces makes partiality and arbitrariness impossible. He is intensely conscious of the dimness and fragmentariness of truth's revelation of herself. Besides, he is diffident of his own decisions, and vividly susceptible to the influence of opposing judgments. He is probably liable to an excess of self-distrust. But, beyond all that, he ever speaks and acts under the restraint of a reverent respect for the personality of others. He shrinks from the thought of intruding on their freedom, or of overbearing their convictions by the mere pressure of personal assertion. He is jealous of creating beliefs in his hearers by aught but the truth itself, and he would not, if he could, overcome an opponent by the force of a more dynamic personality. It is a delicate, a gracious, and a rare scrupulosity. Surely, if any man ever did, Dr. Davidson has earned the benediction pronounced by Daub on "the man who has not forced his convictions upon others."

It is a question in some minds, whether Professor Davidson does not push his reticence of judgment too far. Does not his neutrality amount to self-effacement? And has not his reserve the effect of paralysing that moral influence which personality was meant to have in the formation of opinion? We think not. Probably our Professor could not be other than he is. And for our own part, we would not have him different if he could. There are plenty of people to be definite and dogmatic; not many to be believingly diffident and doubtful. Surely it is good, now and then, to have with us one, whose attitude to the enigmas of life is like that of the old Hebrew poet, who said:

“Lord, my heart is not haughty,
Nor mine eyes lofty;
Neither do I exercise myself in great matters,
Or in things too high for me.”

More harm to truth and human happiness has come from over-certainty and presumptuous self-assertion, than has ever resulted from suspense of judgment and patient waiting. As was sagely remarked by Rousseau: “Si nous savions ne vouloir pas guérir malgré la nature, nous ne mourrions jamais par la main du médecin; si nous savions ignorer la vérité, nous ne serions jamais les dupes du mensonge.” It is a weakness of human nature to be impatient of indeterminate issues, to demand clear-cut verdicts, and to snatch at premature decisions. It is a grievance we have against Providence, that it will not satisfy our craving. Perchance the delay is due to a wider vision, and a juster sense of the mixed and conflicting elements that complicate every problem of human existence.

It is usually in the domain of criticism that Dr. Davidson is blamed for excessive reticence. Unjustly, we imagine. For, so far as he has found solid footing amid the shifting sands of conjecture, he has made known his opinion modestly but without reserve. If he has not been able to

announce much that was either very positive or very startling, those who are acquainted with the history of Old Testament criticism will hardly count that his fault. In good sooth, we are not sure that our Professor occupies himself much with abstract critical questions. Possibly, having a taste for the poetry and religious genius of the Old Testament, he prefers a more succulent and nourishing diet. He is content to crack the nut without standing on ceremony with the husk, appropriates the kernel for his own enjoyment, leaves the mastication of the shells to those who like them, and stands by to watch the operation with interest and admiration, but without envy. We cannot resist the suspicion that this is at least often his attitude to critical discussions. In the following passage from his pen there is, in the tense terseness of the wording, something that reminds us of that movement of accent and emphasis of delivery which modify the Hebrew tense, when the personal feeling of the speaker escapes into what he is saying. "The critics are very fond of going into the prophet's workshop, and revealing to us the whole genesis of his great works. It is very pleasant to hear them talk, and to be told with certainty what suggested this touch, and to whom is due the merit of first creating this other beautiful line or charming curve. And their conversation so corruscates with first principles that no guide is so entertaining as a good critic. There are persons dull or dreamy enough to feel bored by them, who are so intoxicated by the beauty of a great creation itself that they do not care a whit how it arose, and who prefer to stand in silence before it, drinking in what of its meaning they are able through their own natural untutored eyesight." If those of us, who are critics, should find this somewhat too cavalier in tone, we must remember the realistic bias of Professor Davidson's mind, and forgive him. His spirit searches out instinctively the substance, and may be too scornful of forms. With

Zwingle he would say, “*Christiani hominis est non de dogmatis magnifice loqui, sed cum Deo ardua semper et magna facere.*” Therefore he has religiously eschewed petty religious controversy, and has resolutely put from him the profitless occupation of logic chopping and word splitting. He leaves artificial distinctions and metaphysical abstractions to take care of themselves, and concentrates the attention of himself and his disciples on the actual forces, and laws, and realities of this solemn life of ours, and on that God in whom we live, and move, and have our being.

In this high calling, it seems to me, that that same quality of self-repression stands him in good stead. Is not the supreme excellence of his commentaries precisely their impersonality? We have, where it is wanted, the opinion of the commentator; but for the most part, with no third personality interposed between, we confront the thought of the author restored to life and breath and motion. What of those expositions of Old Testament theology, in which we seem to see the actual operation of inspiration and revelation, and feel ourselves not discussing a doctrine, but beholding human souls touched and fashioned by the fingers of God, till we put our shoes off our feet because the place we stand upon is holy ground? And what shall we say of those ethical delineations of the movements of sin and salvation, faith and doubt, of temptation and despair, of repentance, love, and aspiration within the sanctuary of the human heart, that hold men spell-bound, that stir deep and strange memories, and that light up the perplexities and enigmas of spiritual experience with the radiance of a revelation? Whence comes this fine faculty of interpretive realisation? Whence this gift of historical and dramatic reproduction of the life of other men and alien ages? Must not one lose his own life before he can gain an inner knowledge of the life of another? It is the harvest of self-repression. How too are we to account for

the most potent ingredient in the preacher's spell? How is it that we come to forget him, and feel ourselves in actual and awful contact with the ultimate mysteries of existence, as though through him forces reach us that emerge from eternity? Were this possible with a preacher of more assertive and obtrusive personality? Is it not the predestined guerdon of him, who with a powerful and intense personality combines the exquisite gift of a lowly spirit, and practises habitually the virtue of self-abnegation?

In Dr. Davidson's contribution to the religious future of his country, this quality has played an important part. He has taught his students patience and self-distrust; he has inculcated in them intellectual humility; he has inspired them with a wise dread of that hard dogmatism, believing or unbelieving, which is not faith but rationalism. He has showed them that disbelief has its difficulties as well as belief. He has accustomed them to doubt their own doubts. Better than a more positive thinker could, he has prepared the ministry of the future to encounter a period of strain and transition. For the temper best fitted for such an ordeal is not the unbending hardness of cast-iron, but the elastic toughness of steel. They will be ready to give all to criticism that is its due, without fancying that change of form is loss of faith, or fearing that the progress of science will banish the mysterious and the supernatural from our world. If the Church of Christ within our borders should pass through the present trial of faith without panic, without reactionary antagonism to truth, and without loss of spiritual power, a very large share of the credit will belong to the quiet but commanding influence of the Hebrew chair in that college, which rises so picturesquely on the ancient site of Mary of Guise's palace in Edinburgh.

W. GRAY ELMSLIE.

*THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, OR THE CLOSING
LABOURS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.*

I.

As we read the Epistle to the Philippians, we feel that the Apostle in his Roman prison was looking for speedy martyrdom. In many respects therefore he regarded his work as finished. At the same time he felt that his "abiding in the flesh" was a help to the Churches which he had founded, and which he would fain visit once again (Phil. i. 24). In this aspect there seemed still a work for him to do.

We are not told in the book of the Acts which of the two possibilities was realized. In its closing verses it refers to the two years of Paul's captivity in Rome, but does not tell us to what issue they led. This abrupt conclusion of the narrative in the Acts is remarkable and difficult to explain; but it appears to me more easy to account for it on the supposition that these two years of imprisonment were followed by a period of renewed activity, into the details of which the writer did not propose to enter, than on the supposition that they terminated in a violent death, to which he could so easily have referred in a single line.

We are inclined therefore to accept as the more probable, the idea that the Apostle was set free, and was thus enabled to renew his labours for the good of the Church either in the East or West. We know that his plan, when in the year 59 he left Corinth to repair to Jerusalem and thence to Rome, was not to take up his abode in Rome, but simply to pass through it on his way into Spain, that he might fulfil the ministry which he had received of the Lord, to carry to the very end of the earth the testimony of the gospel of His grace. Was it given him to fulfil this purpose? Most modern writers think not. Even those critics who, like Weiss and Farrar, believe in the liberation of the Apostle

after his two years of captivity in Rome, do not suppose him to have ever visited Spain. They cite the words used in the Epistle to the Philippians and in that to Philemon, in which Paul encourages his readers to look for a speedy visit from him in the East, and take them to imply that he had abandoned all thought of a mission to Spain. They note also that no Church in Spain pretends to the honour of having been founded by the Apostle. But none of these reasons are decisive. The Apostle might, during his captivity, have received tidings from the East, making him feel bound to return there as soon as possible, and to defer his visit to Spain till these more pressing claims had been met. And if there is no Church in Spain claiming the honour of having Paul for its founder, it is at least possible that, having reached Spain, his work may have been intercepted by a fresh arrest, before he had time to raise any lasting monument of his visit. Thirty years after the death of St. Paul, Clement, bishop of Rome, writing to the Corinthians, says that “Paul, after preaching the gospel from the rising to the setting sun, and teaching righteousness throughout the whole world, arrived at the extremity of the West; and after suffering martyrdom in the presence of the rulers, he was set free from this earth and reached the holy place prepared for him.” Now it does not seem to me possible to suppose, as so many critics do, that by this expression, “the *extremity* of the West,” Rome is meant; especially after the words going before, “from the rising to the setting sun,” and “throughout the whole world.” Rome, so far from being the “extremity” of the world, was rather regarded as its centre. It was not the seven hills of Rome, but the Pillars of Hercules, which Strabo, writing at this period, called, “The Ends of the Earth,” *πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης*, and Velleius Paternus, *Extremus nostri orbis terminus*.¹ That an author writing at Jerusalem or at

¹ See Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, p. 332.

Ephesus might perchance have so designated Rome, would be conceivable, but that any one writing from Rome itself should use such an expression, seems to me an altogether inadmissible supposition.¹ We are confirmed in the idea that this is not Clement's true meaning by another passage also written at Rome, and bearing testimony to the tradition then current in that Church. It occurs in the Fragment of Muratori, where the writer refers to the "passion of Peter and the departure of Paul from Rome for Spain." It is possible, of course, that this tradition, which is handed down also in the writings of the later Fathers, may have been only a conclusion drawn by them from Romans xv. 24. But this explanation does not seem to me probable in view of the two passages we have quoted, in which the circumstance of Paul's departure for Spain is mentioned quite incidentally, as a well-known and positive fact.

We are not so much concerned at present with the question whether Paul went into Spain, as whether, in the event of his liberation, he again visited the Churches of Macedonia, the Church at Philippi, and the Churches in Asia, according to the hope expressed by him in the Epistle to Philemon. This question is inseparable from that of the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles. Some scholars have endeavoured to separate the two, assigning to these epistles, of which they acknowledge the genuineness, some date prior to Paul's imprisonment in Rome and during the course of his active ministry.² But these suppositions are

¹ It is objected that in this expression, "having arrived at the extremity of the West, and having suffered martyrdom before the rulers," Clement clearly describes the well-known scene of Paul's martyrdom as "the extremity of the West." But this is not exact. The expression used by Clement will bear the construction that Paul, after reaching Spain, was arrested in that country, and afterwards suffered martyrdom in Rome before the rulers.

² Thus an attempt has been made to fix the date of 1st Timothy between the Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, during Paul's sojourn at Ephesus. The same date, or a little later, is given to the Epistle to Titus, it being placed between

more and more untenable. It is impossible to find, during Paul's active ministry in Greece and in Asia Minor, or during the two years of his first captivity in Rome, circumstances corresponding to the biographical details contained in the three Pastoral Epistles. This has been demonstrated so often and so decisively that we need not stay now to adduce proof. Moreover, these three epistles are so closely connected both in thought and in style, and so distinctly marked out from all the other writings of Paul, that it is impossible to intersperse them among the rest. Lastly, the unsound teaching to which reference is made in the Pastoral Epistles is clearly the heresy of the false teachers at Colosse, which only arose during the captivity of the Apostle in Rome. If this false doctrine had already spread through the Churches of Asia before Paul's arrest at Jerusalem, he would certainly have alluded to it in his charge to the pastors of the Churches of Ephesus and Miletus, to watch against the "grievous wolves" which, after his departing, would enter in among them to destroy the flock (Acts xx.).

We find ourselves then shut up to two alternatives. Either the Pastoral Epistles are genuine, and in that case, they date from the time between the liberation of the Apostle and his martyrdom, and are the latest monument we have of his apostolic work; or they are spurious productions. On the latter supposition, criticism must find some explanation of the purpose of such a forgery.

The majority of the critics at the present day incline to the view last given, though the evidence of tradition is as strong in favour of the authenticity of the Pastoral as of any of the other Epistles. There is a correspondence scarcely to be mistaken between certain expressions in the Epistle to Titus and the First Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle

1st and 2nd Corinthians. The 2nd Timothy is supposed to have been written during Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea, or very early in the Roman captivity.

of Clement of Rome; while it is impossible to deny the allusions to the Pastoral Epistles in the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp. These are indeed recognised even by those who dispute the authenticity of those epistles. The ancient Syriac Bible, as well as the Latin, in the second half of the second century, contained the Pastoral Epistles with all the others, and the Fragment of Muratori expressly records their admission into the canon, notwithstanding their originally private character. The Fathers at the close of the second century quote them as unanimously accepted. The two Gnostics, Basilides and Marcion, seem indeed to have rejected them, but this is not to be wondered at.

If then in modern times the majority of critics coincide in denying the authenticity of all three, or of one or other of them, it must be on account of their contents. Schleiermacher was the first to call in question the First Epistle to Timothy, mainly on the ground of the want of connexion in the thoughts. Eichhorn and de Wette, feeling that the three letters bore too strong a resemblance not to proceed from the same writer, rejected also the two others. Baur endeavoured to explain the purpose of these apocryphal writings, as being to combat the Gnostic heresies of the second century, particularly the heresy of Marcion, and to reconcile the two parties into which the Church was at that time divided. He thought that they were the work of three different writers. At the present day many critics are reverting to a modified view, and are prepared to admit that at least the Epistle to Titus and the Second to Timothy are in part genuine. Their theory is, that these were originally short letters addressed by St. Paul to his two colleagues, and receiving their present form from later hands. These critics endeavour to reproduce the short original letters, by a process of arbitrary selection, in which it is scarcely needful to say each of them is guided by his own particular bias.

One thing is clear: these epistles do differ from all the rest in certain very marked particulars. The Apostle seems in them to be more occupied than was his wont with the future of the Church, and attaches greater importance to the various ecclesiastical offices on which that future might largely depend. He has before him dangerous teaching, which is spreading among the Churches, and which, if it became prevalent, would gravely undermine true piety. This teaching is of an altogether different character from the Pharisaic, Judaising doctrine, against which he had protested in his earlier epistles. Lastly, there is an evident want of cohesion in the ideas expressed and in the subjects treated, and a frequent repetition of certain forms of speech, which do not occur in the earlier epistles.

What conclusion must we draw from these various indications? Is it true that there never was a period in the life of the Apostle when new considerations, of which there is no trace in his earlier epistles, may have come to occupy his mind? Is it true that there is no reason to suppose that towards the close of his life, his teaching may have taken a new direction, and may have found expression in new modes of speech appropriate to the changed conditions? Is it true that the unsound teaching against which he charges his colleagues to contend earnestly, can be no other than the Gnostic heresies of the second century, which would necessarily imply that these epistles are the work of some forger assuming the name of St. Paul? Is it true, lastly, that the ecclesiastical organisation, to which the writer distinctly refers, belongs to a time long subsequent to the life of St. Paul?

These are the main questions which present themselves at the present stage of the discussion, and which we now propose to examine as briefly as possible. Before doing so however, let us give a short summary of the contents of the three epistles.

II.

First Epistle to Timothy.—The title of *Apostle* which Paul applies to himself in the opening words of this epistle, and which has been regarded as an indication of its spuriousness, only shows that Paul does not consider this a purely private letter, but rather addresses Timothy as a functionary of the Church under his direction.

The epistle consists of two parts. In the first the Apostle treats of three subjects: 1st, The true gospel teaching, which must be preserved from any admixture, and especially from any legal element. It was with a view to this that when Paul was departing into Macedonia he desired Timothy to remain at Ephesus. There he would have to contend with persons who, while calling themselves doctors of the law, have no true comprehension of it, and apply it to the faithful, while it is really only given for evil-doers. The gospel which Paul teaches, and which he has himself been taught by deep experience, excludes any such admixture. It was to be Timothy's task to uphold in its purity this gospel which others were thrusting from them (ch. i.). 2nd, The second subject treated is worship. It is the duty of the Church to pray for the pagan rulers of the land, and for all men without distinction. In the assemblies of the Church the women are to wear modest attire, and to keep silence. Their sphere is home (ch. ii.). 3rd, The third subject is the ministry. Reference is made to the bishopric and the diaconate—two offices indispensable to the life of Church, and in regard to which Timothy is enjoined to use special vigilance. The Apostle describes the moral qualifications required in bishops and deacons, without which they could not command the respect of the Church (iii. 1-13).

In the second part of the epistle (beginning ch. iii. 14), instructions are given to Timothy as to the way in which

he ought to conduct himself towards the Church in general, and to its various classes in particular. And first towards the Church as a whole. He must keep before him its high destiny. It is the pillar on which the mystery of salvation is inscribed that all the world may read. Timothy is charged to use the more watchfulness over it, because the spirit of prophecy foretells a time coming when there shall be a great falling away from the faith ; when a spirit of false asceticism will creep into the Church under the guise of superior sanctity, but based in truth upon the impious idea that the whole material part of the works of God is to be ascribed to the spirit of evil. Timothy is to put the Church specially on its guard against such teaching, and is himself sedulously to avoid any approach to this error. He is to command the respect of the Church in spite of his youth, and is not to allow anything to quench the gift which is in him, and which had been imparted “ by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery ” (ch. iii. 14–iv. 16). Then follow counsels as to his behaviour towards the older members of both sexes, and towards the younger sisters and widows. The Apostle here adds some injunctions with regard to widows who may be called to a ministry of practical benevolence in the Church. He then gives rules as to the treatment of presbyters, or elders, who are evidently the same as the bishops spoken of in ch. iii. They were there designated bishops or overseers, with reference to their function in the Church ; here they are spoken of as presbyters or elders, in recognition of their dignity. Paul adds on this subject, a little word of counsel to Timothy himself (ch. v.) ; and concludes with some further admonitions to slaves who have become “ believers and beloved ” (ch. vi. 1, 2) ; to those who have already been led away from the truth by false teachers ; and to the rich in this world’s goods (ch. vi. 17–19). A brief salutation, and one final word of warning (ch. vi. 20–22), bring the epistle to a close.

The Epistle to Titus.—The elaborate superscription of this letter shows that this is not in any way a private communication, but an official charge given by Paul to his deputy. The main body of the letter (ch. i. 5–iii. 11) treats of two subjects: 1st, *The presbytery*. Paul had left Titus in Crete for this express purpose—that he should appoint elders in every city to carry on the work commenced. He had there to contend with false Judaising teaching (ch. i.). 2nd, In the second part of the epistle (ch. ii. 1–iii. 11) Paul goes on, as in the Epistle to Timothy, to give counsels to Titus as to his behaviour towards various classes in the Church—the old, the young, slaves, etc. The grace offered to all ought to sanctify all, and Titus is to conduct himself in such a manner as to commend this grace of God to all. Paul then adds directions as to the bearing to be maintained towards pagan magistrates, and pagans generally; lastly towards the Church, as a whole, which must be carefully guarded against profane teaching.

The epistle closes as usual, with commissions and salutations. When Titus is released from his responsibility by the arrival of his successor, he is to rejoin Paul at Nicopolis, where the Apostle will pass the winter.

Second Epistle to Timothy.—This letter is of a more private, personal, and intimate character; hence in the superscription Paul omits the title Apostle.

In the body of the letter (ch. i. 6–iv. 8) three subjects are dealt with: 1st, *Timothy's own deportment*. He is to stir up the gift which is in him, and not allow himself to be daunted by fear of the sufferings which the service of Christ may bring upon him. Paul encourages him by four considerations: the grandeur of the gospel, his own example and that of the faithful Onesiphorus, and lastly by the sure hope of the Christian (ch. i. 6–ii. 13). 2nd, *The Church*. This has been invaded by teaching to no profit, and tending only to barren disputations. Nevertheless

there still remains a nucleus of true believers, bearing the Divine seal of holiness. Timothy must not be discouraged therefore, but contend firmly and patiently for the truth. There is even reason to expect that in the last times a moral corruption, like that of the heathen world, may find its way into the Church itself. Already some Christians have become perverted. In order to counteract their influence, the Apostle gives Timothy three counsels. He is to remember the example of constancy which he had witnessed in Paul himself (during his first sojourn in Lycaonia); he is to feed continually upon the Scriptures inspired of God; and to redouble his vigilance and activity in evangelistic work (ii. 14–iv. 5). 3rd, The third subject is the Apostle himself. He speaks first of his approaching martyrdom, then he asks Timothy to come as soon as possible, because all his fellow-workers, except Luke, are absent. He urges that Mark should come with him, and desires him to bring also the cloak and the books which he (Paul) had left in Asia Minor. Lastly, he refers to his first appearance before the imperial judgment seat, which gave him an opportunity of fully proclaiming the gospel message, and yet did not lead to his condemnation.

In the concluding sentences he refers to, or explains incidentally, the absence of two of his fellow-workers (ver. 20). Then come greetings to a few brethren, all of them bearing Roman names.

We must now turn to the main objections to which we have already alluded.

III.

1. *The teaching of the Apostle*, both as to form and substance.

It is asserted that the conception of the gospel presented in these letters differs notably from the well-known teaching of the Apostle Paul. The great fundamental doctrines

of the Apostle of the Gentiles, justification by faith and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, are scarcely touched upon. The great theme in these epistles is the application of the gospel to outward conduct. Those who have believed in God are to be “careful to maintain good works, for these things are good and profitable to men” (Tit. iii. 8). “The end of the commandment is love” (1 Tim. i. 5). For the most part the practical side of the Christian virtues is alone brought into prominence. We shall see presently what particular reasons the Apostle may have had for insisting on this aspect of Christian truth. But independently of such considerations, it is easy to understand that the gospel teaching having been once clearly formulated, and thoroughly established by the earlier labours of the Apostle in the Churches founded by him, as well as in the minds of his colleagues, he might now feel it opportune to insist rather on the practical application of the truths learned to daily life. Those who have witnessed a great revival, such as took place half a century ago in the Reformed Churches of the Continent, know with what somewhat excessive insistence the doctrines were preached which Paul brought into prominence in his earlier epistles. The almost exclusive theme of the preaching was salvation by grace, in opposition to works. Then when these doctrines had laid hold of the minds of men, and had become, so to speak, a bond of union for the whole religious public, preachers began again, little by little, to insist on the moral aspect of the gospel. M. Vinet’s famous sermon, “Faith—a Work,” clearly marked this new phase in the life of our Churches. Not that this fresh departure was really in an opposite direction; but it was determined by new needs which had arisen, and was, in a manner, supplementary to that which preceded it. The present writer has personally known preachers, who, after being foremost among their brethren in re-discovering, so to speak, the foundation-truths of the

gospel, took a no less prominent part when the preaching again assumed a decidedly practical character. If such a change as this has been traceable in our own day, why may we not suppose a similar modification in the apostolic teaching of St. Paul, especially if the circumstances of the time seemed to demand it?

Criticism exacts, however, that the mode of speech at any rate should not change, and that the style of the Apostle in these epistles should not differ markedly from that of his other epistles recognised as genuine. But we are told that such a strongly marked difference does exist. It is shown that a number of words are used in these three epistles which do not occur in any of the earlier letters. In the First Epistle to Timothy there are 81 such words; in the Second, 63; in Titus, 44. Several expressions also occur repeatedly, such as "faithful is the saying," "sound doctrine," "a life in all godliness," etc., which are not found in any of the earlier writings, and some entirely new terms descriptive of the unsound teaching leavening the Church at this time: "endless genealogies," "vain talking," "old wives' fables," etc.

To this we reply that diversity of verbiage is a marked feature throughout the literary career of the Apostle. It results partly no doubt from the wealth and creative fulness of his genius, partly from the ever varying experiences through which he passed in his intercourse with the Churches. M. Reuss himself remarks that the two Epistles to the Corinthians contain as many words foreign to those to the Romans and Galatians, as the Pastoral Epistles contain of expressions foreign to all the other letters. In the Epistle to the Galatians there are 57 terms which occur nowhere else; in the Philippians, 54; in the Colossians and Ephesians together, 143. To the causes already assigned for this constant variation, other indirect influences may be added; as for instance, the natural

wealth of the Greek language and the fruitfulness of Christian thought. Hence M. Reuss attaches no weight to the argument derived from style, and in order to show what an unsafe guide such criticism is, he mentions that among those who follow it, Schleiermacher concludes that the Pastoral Epistles are the work of two authors, Baur of three, and de Wette of one writer only. We conclude then that the teaching of these letters furnishes no proof, either in form or in substance, that they are not from the pen of St. Paul. It only shows that they belong to a particular period—the closing period of his apostolic labours. This conclusion is confirmed by the analysis we are about to make of the teaching against which he contends, and which presented itself to his two fellow-labourers in the Churches where they were at work.

2. *The teaching protested against in the Pastoral Epistles.* It has been said that this heretical teaching cannot be of an earlier date than the second century; that the different Gnostic systems of that advanced period are clearly described, particularly those of Valentinus and Marcion. Other critics dispute this, and suppose the heresies referred to to be those of Cerinthus and the Ophites, at the beginning of the second or the close of the first century. This theory is equally opposed to the authorship of St. Paul.

But two features of the heresies indicated by the Apostle are incompatible with either of these suppositions. The first is that they do not appear to contain elements directly opposed to the gospel, as do the systems of Marcion and Valentinus. The Gnostic system taught that the God who created the world was not the same God whom Jesus Christ called His Father; they maintained that the Jewish law was also the work of this other God, who was inferior to the Father of Jesus Christ. They did not hold that the Saviour appeared in a true human body, etc. Such doctrines as these are wholly subversive of the gospel

preached by Paul. But the errors referred to in the Pastoral Epistles are characterized merely as “profane and old wives’ fables,” “vain babblings,” “oppositions of science falsely so called.” Those who formulate them are spoken of as “vain talkers,” tickling the fancy of men without real piety, who look upon religion rather as a harmless amusement than as a serious means of sanctification. The danger here is of substituting intellectualism in religion for piety of heart and life. Had the writer been a Christian of the second century trying, under the name of Paul, to stigmatise the Gnostic systems, he would certainly have used much stronger expressions to describe their character and influence. He would have found in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians a model of the Pauline polemics with regard to teachings subversive of the gospel. The second characteristic of the heresies referred to in the Pastoral Epistles is their Jewish origin. The doctors who propagate them are called “teachers of the law, though they understand neither what they say nor whereof they confidently affirm.” They are Judaising Christians (“they of the circumcision,” Tit. i. 10), raising foolish contentions about the law (ch. iii. 9), and teaching “Jewish fables” (ch. i. 14), to which they add “endless genealogies,” evidently also Jewish, for they are classed by the writer with “fightings about the law” (Tit. iii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 4), and form part of the teaching of those who call themselves “teachers of the law” (ver. 7). It has sometimes been asserted that this term “genealogies” refers to the successive emanations of aeons, taught by Valentinus. But this Gnostic was the sworn foe of everything Jewish. A much more natural reference is to the genealogies in Genesis, which these teachers were in the habit of allegorising, and in which they contrived to discover all sorts of mysteries, with which they entertained their followers. But the epithet “*endless*” which the Apostle gives to these genealogies excludes this reference, for each

of the genealogies in Genesis is composed of a fixed and easily calculable number of terms—the number *ten*. It seems therefore more probable that the reference here is to a sphere in which imagination might have full play, namely, the genealogies of angels. We know to what an extent the Judaism of later times delighted to amplify the sober references to the angels made in Scripture. The book of Enoch, which was widely circulated at this time, even in the Church (as is evident from the use made of it in Jude), is an illustration in point. The Essenes had in their teaching a special chapter on the *names of angels*, which the initiate swore not to divulge. There were then probably teachers who traded in these so-called revelations, and who, as we read in Titus i. 11, “taught them for filthy lucre’s sake.” The First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus teach us, further, that these doctors made legal distinctions between meats pure and impure, which is obviously Jewish, and contrary to the Gnostic systems of the second century. Cerinthus, who lived at the close of the first century, was indeed a Jew, and introduced Judaising elements into his teaching. For example, he recognised circumcision. But there is not a word in the epistles before us, pointing to this error. In fact, two men of such different schools of thought as Weiss and Holzmann, agree in the acknowledgment that no recognised heresy corresponds to the picture drawn in the Pastoral Epistles. This would be indeed strange if the writer had intended to combat forms of error so well known as those of the close of the first, and of the second century.

The natural solution presents itself, if we accept the Pastoral Epistles as closely connected with the Epistle to the Colossians. There we read of teachers who were trying to bring the Church into legal bondage, advocating the law as a higher means of sanctification and illumination; making distinctions between days and meats, like the weak

Christians spoken of in Romans xiv., and taking up the worship of angels, in order to obtain from them revelations as to the celestial world (Col. ii. 16–18). One step further in the same direction will put us in touch with the false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles, who only represent a further stage of degeneracy in the direction of Judaism. They are the precursors of the Cabbala, which is a natural outgrowth of their doctrine.

De Wette lays much stress on this difficulty—that the heretics referred to in the Pastoral Epistles are sometimes spoken of as actually present in the Church, while in other passages (such as 1 Tim. iv. 1 *et seq.*; 2 Tim. iii. 1 *et seq.*) they are referred to as threatening the Church of the future. By this, we are told, the forger betrays himself. In the former passages, he forgets himself and makes the mistake of representing as actually existing forms of error which in the times of the Apostle were still in the future. But in that case, as Weiss justly observes, these moments of forgetfulness, in which heresy is spoken of as a present fact, ought to be the exception, not the rule. But the very opposite is the case. And if we look into it more closely, we find that all this supposed confusion of present and future vanishes away. The adversaries to be combated—those foolish and profane teachers who lead away superficial believers by their vain imaginings—are actually present in the Churches under the care of Titus and Timothy. But in one passage (1 Tim. iv. 1 *et seq.*) the reference is to an entirely different form of error—a doctrine of asceticism, based upon a dualist theory, by which certain meats and natural acts are forbidden as immoral. The history of the Church contains many fulfilments of this prophecy. In another passage (2 Tim. iii. 1 *et seq.*) the reference is to a growing corruption of the Church itself, of which there are already indications. There is no allusion to any of the great heresies. It is a prophecy of that general corruption

which Christ Himself predicted as coming at the end of the age. Paul has already referred to this prophetic picture in one of his earlier letters (2 Thess. ii. 7), adding: "For the mystery of lawlessness does already work."

There is then no confusion in this respect in the epistles before us, and we are afresh led to this result: That the false teachings referred to by Paul are for the most part those of his own lifetime, but that they belong to a period rather more advanced than the Epistles written from his Roman prison, especially that to the Colossians.

IV.

Church Organisation.—Several modern critics, following Baur, have assumed that the ecclesiastical offices referred to in the Pastoral Epistles indicate a much later date than the apostolic age. The functions of presbyter and deacon seem much more strictly defined than is likely to have been the case in the first century. The position of Titus and of Timothy in relation to the elders or presbyters, seems suggestive rather of the monarchical episcopate of the second century. The ministry of widows, as described (1 Tim. v.), can hardly be anything else than the office of deaconesses-sisters, spoken of in ecclesiastical writings of a later date; as, for instance, when Ignatius says to the Christians at Smyrna, "I salute the virgins, called widows."

But there are two insuperable difficulties in the way of this theory: (1) the plurality of presbyters in each Church (Tit. i. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 14), and (2) their complete equality of position. These are the distinctive marks of the presbytery or episcopate of apostolic times, in opposition to that of a later period, when the bishopric was entrusted to one man, who was set over the college of presbyters.¹ Un-

¹ I do not propose to enter here in detail into the question so much under discussion at the present time, of the relation between the presbyters and the bishop in the apostolic Church. It seems to me, from the latest evidence, that

doubtedly reference is made in 1 Timothy iv. 14 to a council of presbyters as an organised body, which had concurred with Paul in setting Timothy apart for his office, by the laying on of hands. But, in the first place, that which was thus conferred on Timothy was not the office of bishop, but simply a call to evangelistic work (2 Tim. iv. 5). And this rite of the laying on of hands to set apart to some work of ministry was practised in the Church from the earliest times, as for example, at Antioch, where the prophets and teachers laid hands on Barnabas and Saul to designate them for their missionary journey among the Gentiles. Even earlier than this the same practice is referred to in the Church at Jerusalem, when the apostles laid hands on the "seven men of good report" chosen to administer the alms of the Church to the poor. It is, indeed, an Old Testament usage, for Moses laid his hands on Joshua to transmit to him his office; and the same practice was observed when the heads of an Israelite household transferred to the Levites the duty properly devolving on their eldest sons, to serve in the sanctuary. It is then perfectly natural, that when Timothy departed from Lycaonia with Paul and Silas for a new mission among the Gentiles, the elders of the Church should have united with Paul in imploring for him the unction of the Holy One to qualify him for his evangelistic work, to which he was thus set apart.

It is no matter of surprise then if, in 1 Timothy iii.,

the *bishop* referred to in Titus i. 7 must be the same person with regard to whom Paul has just said (ver. 5) that Titus should "appoint *elders* in every city." It is clear also that the *bishop* of whom Paul speaks (1 Tim. iii. 1) is one of those presbyters or elders referred to in ch. v. 17-22. For, as Paul passes directly in ch. iii. from the *bishop* to the *deacon*, no place is left for the presbyters, as holding a separate office from the *bishop*. Compare again Acts xx. 17 and 28, where Paul says to the presbyters of the Ephesian Church, "That the Holy Ghost has made them *bishops* to feed the Church of God." Perhaps I may find another opportunity to take up this question with reference to recent discussions on the subject.

Paul speaks of the diaconate as a recognised office, especially in a large Church like that of Ephesus. The opening words of the Epistle to the Philippians show that in another and probably much smaller Church, this office was already existing side by side with that of the bishop. If the epistles before us had been written in the second century, by some one assuming the name of Paul, why should he have omitted the deacons in the Epistle to Titus? On the other hand, it is quite natural that if the Church of Crete had been only recently founded, this second office should not yet have been required.

In the passage referring to *widows* in 1 Timothy v., careful attention should be paid to the transition in ver. 9 from those who are widows in the ordinary sense to those who may be enrolled as such for the service of the Church, in the care of orphans and strangers and the poor. Whatever Weizsäcker may say on this point, it seems to us perfectly clear that it is in this sense of a recognised servant of the Church, that the title of deaconess is given to Phœbe, in Romans xii. 1, 2.

All the references then in the Pastoral Epistles to offices in the Church seem to be closely connected with the elements of Church organisation which we find mentioned in the earlier Epistles. The Apostle is indeed more occupied than formerly with the duties and responsibilities of these servants of the Church. This arises no doubt partly from the ever-increasing gravity of the danger to the Churches from these unsound doctrines, and from the yet more deadly errors which he forecasts in the future. Then the Apostle has a prevision of his own approaching end; and to these two causes of anxiety on the Church's account, a third is to be added, of which we must now speak more at length.

In the early days of the Church at Jerusalem, reference is made to presbyters or elders, in whose hands Barnabas and

Paul placed the moneys collected at Antioch for the poor of the flock at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30). These same elders are spoken of again as taking part in the assembly which decided the conditions of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church (Acts xv. 2, 6, 22). But it does not appear that these elders, as such, were preachers. Their office seems rather to have been administrative. Paul and Barnabas, in their first mission into Asia Minor, before leaving the Churches which they had founded there, appointed elders whom they set apart with fasting and prayer. It is probable that the ministry of these elders was of a spiritual as well as administrative character. For the apostles, not being themselves present in the Churches, the oversight and spiritual guidance of them would naturally devolve on these elders. This could not be the case to the same degree in Jerusalem, where the apostles themselves still resided.

Somewhat later, at Thessalonica, there were in the Church leaders or overseers, who carried on the work among the faithful. The reference here is clearly to a ministry of a spiritual nature, but only under the form of the cure of souls (ch. v. 12-14), not under that of preaching. This is spoken of as the gift of prophecy, and was doubtless bestowed on those who filled the post of teachers in the Church (ch. v. 19, 20).

At Corinth, the spontaneous manifestation of the Spirit under the three forms of prophecy, the gift of tongues, and teaching, seems exceptionally abundant. Yet the regular offices could not be dispensed with. Why should not Paul have instituted them here as well as in Lycaonia and at Thessalonica? They are indeed mentioned in the long enumeration of the various gifts, under the name of "helps" and "governments," *ἀντιλίψεις, κυβερνήσεις* (1 Cor. xii. 28). Both are spoken of in the plural, because these two functions had their various spheres of duty; but both offices were certainly recognised. For if they had no existence,

why does the Apostle say at the commencement of this passage, “Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit; and there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord” (xii. 4, 5)? Certain gifts then were to be freely exercised: those, namely, which the Apostle describes by the special name of “*gifts*” (*χαρισματα*). But there were others which were to be exercised by regular functionaries appointed by the Church itself, as in the case of the gifts of “*helps and governments*,” which belonged to the presbyters and deacons.

In the Epistle to the Romans, instead of the twelve gifts which flourished at Corinth, we find only seven (Rom. xii. 8); prophecy, ministry (*διακονία*)—which includes no doubt the two offices of which we have just spoken—teaching, and a series of other gifts appertaining to the individual life. We feel that the extraordinary outpouring of gifts at Corinth was a local and temporary fact. The tongues disappeared, and teaching took their place; the gift of prophecy was directly perpetuated in the offices of the Church. Everything tends to settle down into a calmer and more settled state.

Strong confirmation is given to this view by the Epistle to the Ephesians. Here Paul embraces the ministry in all its breadth, as concerning not only the particular Church, but the Church universal. He sees the gifts bestowed by the risen and glorified Lord, and the functions arising out of them taking three forms. First, there is the *foundation* ministry, represented by the apostles and prophets. Secondly, a ministry of *extension* carried on by the evangelists or missionaries. Thirdly, a ministry of *edification* entrusted to the pastors and teachers (iv. 11).

And this is all. The rich abundance of gifts enumerated in the Epistle to the Corinthians, seems to have vanished; or at any rate their place in the Church is a subordinate one. Of all the gifts and offices belonging to the Corinthian

Church, there remain only two—those of pastors and teachers—the pastorate as an office, the teaching as a free gift. The first of these terms clearly includes presbyters and deacons; the second refers to public teaching. But it must be observed that the way in which the Apostle expresses himself (using a singular article for the two names) implies a very close connexion between the functions of pastor and teacher.

Very much the same state of things is suggested by the superscription of the Epistle to the Philippians, “To all the saints which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” Doubtless it is natural, that in addressing a letter, only the offices should be mentioned, the gifts being too uncertain an element to be enumerated. But the absence of any allusion to these gifts in the course of the epistle, shows how far we are receding from the early Corinthian phase of Church life.

If now we turn again to the Pastoral Epistles, we shall naturally expect to find a continuance of the same tendency to blend the gift of teaching with the office of elder. And so it is. According to Titus i. 9, the choice of a presbyter or bishop must only fall on a man who “is able both to exhort in the sound doctrine and to convict the gainsayers.” According to 1 Timothy iii. 2, the bishop must be a man “apt to teach” (see also 2 Tim. ii. 24). Lastly, according to 1 Timothy v. 17, there are two classes of elders—those who confine themselves to administering the affairs of the Church, and those who in addition to this “labour in word and in teaching.” The latter are to be “counted worthy of double honour.” We see that in proportion as the extraordinary gifts of primitive times cease, the offices in the Church increase in importance and in influence, and that the principal gift—that of teaching—which survived all the rest, came to be more and more closely identified with the office of the regular ministry.

The monarchical episcopate of later times is the natural result in part of this progressive fusion of teaching with the primitive episcopate, and in part of the natural tendency of all administrative work to become concentrated in one hand. This change has been realised, at least in Asia Minor, at the time brought before us in the Revelation. The free exercise of the gifts, especially that of prophecy, even by women, still exists, only it is placed under the control of a personage called the Angel of the particular Church, who is charged with the oversight of the flock.¹

This personage can neither be a celestial being nor a purely ideal and poetic personification of the Church. He is a living, responsible, human being, whose mission it is to watch over the progress of the Church, and who is worthy of praise or blame, reward or punishment. This personage can be no other than the head of the presbyterial council, and therefore the representative of the flock, seated, as Ignatius says, surrounded by the circle of elders as by a spiritual crown, with the deacons as helpers.² This development of Church organisation, which was realised in Asia Minor towards the close of the first century, was adopted more gradually in other countries. Just as the current in the middle of a stream is more rapid than that near the banks, so as Dr. Lightfoot has beautifully demonstrated, Asia Minor appears in this respect to have been in advance of the West on the one side (see Clement and Hermes), and of the East on the other, at least with regard to the Judæo-Christian Churches of those countries (see the *Didaché*). Both in Hermes and the *Didaché*, the free gifts

¹ It will one day be seen that it is an utter mistake to place the date of the Apocalypse before the fall of Jerusalem. M. Harnack himself, who holds that the book is in substance Jewish with Christian interpolations, now places the date of the Christian interpolator under Domitian, that is, at the close of the first century. Now the idea of the Angel of the Church belongs to the Christian portion. The German professor is therefore completely in accord with my view of the composition of the whole book.

² *Ad Magnes.* c. 13.

are still in exercise, but it is easy to see that they are already degenerating, and that among them also there is a tendency to unite the teaching with the episcopate (*Didaché* c. 11 and 15). In the time of Justin, the union appears to have been consummated in Rome itself.

The Pastoral Epistles represent one particular point in this movement, the intermediate stage between the Epistles to the Ephesians and Philippians on the one hand, and the Revelation on the other. They do not go beyond the horizon of the life of Paul, but they mark its extreme limit. The Apostle, like a dying father, provides with anxious care, in these the last documents from his pen, for the right guidance of the family he leaves behind. He does, with regard to the Church, but on a lower plane, what Jesus did when He instituted the apostolate.

These then are the main questions throwing doubt on the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, and we have seen that impartially investigated, they resolve themselves rather into proofs of their genuineness. Objections have been also drawn from some details in the letters. It has been asked whether, after the year 64, Paul could have spoken of the youth of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 12). But if Timothy was eighteen years old when Paul took him with him in the year 52, he would have been rather more than thirty in 65, which from the standpoint of the ancients was still young. We may add that the expression used is called forth by the contrast between the comparative youth of Timothy and the gravity of the charge entrusted to him. Again, it is said that in 1 Timothy v. 18, the term *Scripture* is applied to the Gospel of Luke, which would clearly imply a time subsequent to the life of Paul. Undoubtedly, but then it would also imply a date later than that which the same critics assign to the Pastoral Epistles. This objection also falls to the ground, if the term *Scripture* be referred only to the first of the two books quoted—the Book of Deuteronomy.

(See also 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10, 14.) A much more weighty objection is raised by M. Reuss. Why does the Apostle give himself the trouble to write to his colleagues of things which he might have said to them a hundred times while he was with them, or which he could talk over with them when they met again? We reply: with regard to the question of doctrine, it is possible that the errors against which Paul urges them both to contend may have been of quite recent growth; and as to the establishment of the proper offices in the Church, it was natural that he should be greatly concerned about it, as he saw his end drawing near.

In the critical position of the Church, he might feel very keenly the need of giving his colleagues, who were, in a measure, to bear the burden after him, the most precise and urgent and weighty counsels. Events have shown how great was the need for such instructions; for upon these two offices—the episcopate and the diaconate—which Paul, in a manner, institutes in these letters, has depended, and will depend to the end, the normal progress of the Church. The Pastoral Epistles are, in this respect, the Apostle's testament. It is in this sense that the Church has carefully preserved them in the Canon.¹

In return for these difficulties of detail, advanced by those who argue against the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, we may mention others, which we submit to those who attribute these letters to a forger, writing half or three-quarters of a century after the death of St. Paul. Would the supposed forger put into the mouth of Paul the advice he gives to Timothy to take “a little wine for his stomach's sake”? or again the entreaty that he would come to see him in Rome before winter, and bring him from Troas the cloak and the parchments which he had left with Carpus? Would he mention a sojourn of Paul and Titus in Crete,

¹ See the Fragment of Muratori.

of which not a word is said in the Acts of the Apostles? Would he ask him to join him in Nicopolis—a town which has no connexion with any known journey of St. Paul? Would he speak of the speedy coming of Artemas and Tychicus, as his representatives? Would he remind Timothy of the prophecies which accompanied his calling to the work of an evangelist? Would he speak to him of his mother and grandmother by name? If all this is not natural and real, then it is the very height of charlatanism. But such an idea is in manifest moral contradiction with the deeply serious tone of the whole Epistles. The most incongruous thing of all is that Paul, wishing, as we are told, to make Titus and Timothy the representatives of the episcopate of the second century, should have represented Timothy first as a simple evangelist, then as in danger of neglecting his gift and of being ashamed of the gospel testimony, as shrinking back from suffering and scorn, and of allowing himself to be hindered in this way from coming back to his master and friend. Lastly, instead of speaking of them as fixed at their post, as were the bishops, Timothy and Titus are only sojourning for a while with their Churches, and very shortly to rejoin Paul.

V.

It remains for us to inquire whether the historical allusions which occur repeatedly in these letters can be brought together in one period, with any semblance of probability or even possibility. Here we are clearly in the domain of hypothesis. The following explanation seems to me best to reconcile all the data.

Set free from his captivity in the spring of the year 64, Paul departed for the East, as he had said to Philemon and to the Philippian Church. Embarking at Brindisi, the most frequented port of Italy on the eastern side, he arrived at Crete. There he found Titus, who had already

preached the gospel there and founded Churches. Here Paul remained some time with Titus. Then, desiring to fulfil his promise to the Philippians, he left there his faithful servant, who was still to carry on the work, and departed into Macedonia. Trophimus, who accompanied him, fell sick as the ship coasted along the shores of Asia Minor, and was left at Miletus. Paul had only a glimpse in passing of Timothy, who was at this time stationed at Ephesus. Paul exhorted him to remain at his difficult post, instead of becoming his companion, as Timothy would doubtless have preferred. As it was Paul's intention in any case to visit Asia Minor before leaving for the West, he promised Timothy to come back shortly, and continued his voyage. He disembarked at Troas, where he left his cloak and books with Carpus, meaning to take them up again on his return. Arrived in Macedonia, his mind full of anxious thoughts about the grave duties devolving on his two young companions in labour, he wrote to them both—to Timothy with a view to encourage him, to give him fresh counsel, and assure him again of his speedy return; and to Titus to tell him that some one was being sent to take his place, and to beg him to come without delay to join Paul at Nicopolis, probably the town in Thrace, where he proposed to pass the winter, before starting again in the spring for Asia Minor. As far as we can gather, St. Paul seems to have been prevented by some unforeseen circumstance from carrying out this plan. He was not able either to go back to Troas to fetch the things he had left there, or to rejoin Timothy at Ephesus, or to avail himself of Philemon's hospitality at Colosse. He was compelled suddenly to return west. Either he was carried there as a prisoner, having been arrested in Macedonia, or he went of his own accord into Italy in response to some urgent demand upon him. This sudden call may have been the dispersion and comparative

destruction of the Church of Rome under the persecution by Nero. It needed a hand like Paul's to raise again the building from its ruins. It is possible that after performing this duty, he may, at length, in the course of the year 65, have left for Spain, as says the Fragment of Muratori (*perfectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis*). There he must soon have been again taken prisoner and brought back to Rome. From his prison he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he describes his almost utter loneliness, and begs him to come to him before the winter of 65–66. Notwithstanding the favourable issue of his first appearance at the imperial tribunal, when he was enabled to bear his full testimony before the heads of the State, he was soon condemned and executed (probably beheaded) on the Appian Way, near which his tomb was still shown in the second century.

We do not see what valid objection there can be to this hypothetical explanation, which bears out all the allusions contained in the three epistles before us. Even the prophetic words spoken to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 25) thus find their fulfilment: “Behold, I know that ye also, among whom I went about preaching the kingdom, shall see my face no more”; for he was never able to carry out his purpose of again visiting Asia Minor. His presentiment of his coming end (to which, as we see from his words to Philemon, he did not attach the certainty of prophecy) proved truer than at one time he himself supposed.

F. GODET.

*SURVEY OF RECENT OLD TESTAMENT
LITERATURE.*

THE want of a student's edition of the Septuagint¹ has long been felt, and the Cambridge Press has met the want, so far as this was possible, in a manner which leaves no room for criticism. The plan of the Syndics is to bring out ultimately a larger edition, with a much fuller critical apparatus; but in the meantime we have here the variations of the more important uncial codices (*Sinaiticus*, *Alexandrinus*, *Vaticanus*, *Cottonianus* Gen., *Bodleianus* Gen., and *Ambrosianus*), which are placed at the foot of the page. The text is that of the Vatican; where this MS. is defective, the Alexandrine is followed, or, where necessary, the uncial MS. which stands next in age or importance. By the use of a small but clear type and a thin but strong paper, a volume of 855 pages is yet conveniently portable. The study of this version has, we may hope, a great future before it. Introductory helps are still wanting, especially for those who are weak Hebraists. Even for such the importance of the Septuagint is great, though too often the results of their study are not what they ought to be. May we hope that a discussion of this point may lead to some well-devised plan for meeting this want?

Readers of THE EXPOSITOR do not need to be told that Dr. Driver is not only a scholar, but a religious teacher; and in all his philosophical works bears in mind the unique peculiarities of the Hebrew Scriptures. I must honestly say, however, that I do not see how such lessons as are included in this volume² could be utilized by the average Sunday-school teacher. I hope indeed that there is an increasing number of those who are competent to use them; but why should they have a special lesson-book provided for them? What Dr. Driver has given us here is therefore, in my opinion, not to be criticised from a mere school-teacher's point of view. It is a singularly clear introduction to the study of the Pentateuch as a religious literature of composite origin. That

¹ *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint.* Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by H. B. Swete, D.D. Vol. I. Genesis-IV. Kings. (Cambridge: University Press.)

² *Critical Notes on the International Sunday-School Lessons from the Pentateuch for 1887* (Jan. 2nd to June 26th). By S. R. Driver, D.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.)

the charm of the Old Testament becomes manifoldly greater to those who read it in Dr. Driver's at once critical and reverent spirit, I need not spend words in showing. He is a most valuable acquisition to the little group of English and American theologians who, undeterred by conflicting party cries, are carrying on the reconciliation, never perfect but always being perfected, of faith and criticism. I will quote two sentences, from the Introduction and the first lesson respectively, to show Dr. Driver's position.

"We are bound, indeed, as Christians, to accept the authority of the Old Testament, and to see in it a Divine preparation for the revelation of Jesus Christ made in the Gospels; but there is no obligation upon us to accept a specific theory, either of its literary structure or of the course of history which it narrates."

"In their Assyrian or Phoenician form these [mythological] theories are crude in themselves, and associated with a grotesque polytheism; in the hands of the inspired Hebrew historian the same materials—if we are right in calling them the same—are vivified and transformed, and made the vehicle of profound religious truth."

One of the greatest charms of an expository work is lost, when it does not open a door into the writer's heart. It is in fact one of the greatest helps to the appreciation of a biblical writer, to feel that his commentator has absorbed much of the author's spirit, even though he has necessarily mingled with it a very large modern element. This is why the works of Ewald and of Delitzsch are to some students so delightful. But this charm and this kind of helpfulness are totally wanting in the present volume.¹ For all that, a hearty welcome is due to these firstfruits of study. That self-repression which Mr. Spurrell has so largely displayed leads us to hope that when his own individuality does assert itself, we shall find that he has received the spiritual impress of "Hebraism," and also that in pure scholarship he has been ripening fruits which we shall all be glad to enjoy. Meantime, the student of the language and outward form of Genesis will find these unpretending "Notes" indispensable. Mr. Spurrell writes like an experienced teacher, and presents only what is best worth knowing in a clear though condensed form. It would be easy, but would be

¹ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis. With Two Appendices.*
By G. J. Spurrell, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.)

useless here, to discuss points of detail. That he leans mainly on German authorities is a matter of course. Scholars ought to have no petty jealousies; and the names of Davidson, Driver, and (Prof. W. and Dr. C. H. H.) Wright occur frequently enough to show that Mr. Spurrell is cognisant of the best English scholarship. In truth, the literary apparatus is much more complete than that in any existing English handbook to any part of the Old Testament. Perhaps the book might with advantage have been smaller. The archæological and geographical notices, for instance, might perhaps have been left to fuller commentaries. But, considering the greater prominence which is gradually being accorded to archæology in Biblical criticism, I think Mr. Spurrell's course is justified, especially as he has given an appendix on the principal critical theories of the composition of the book. The second appendix deals with the important subject of the origin and signification of **הַוְיָה**, **אֱלֹהִים**.

The large homiletic element in this book¹ prevents it from claiming a place in a strictly exegetical library. But no one can wish to deny that Dr. Milligan has aimed at basing his moral and religious lessons upon a sound view of the text, and has succeeded. It is not indeed a critical view in the full sense which he presupposes; but he prepares the way for more complete teaching. Ewald is generously described as "one of the highest authorities in Old Testament criticism" (p. 64), and as "one of the most eloquent historians of Israel" (p. 107); and if any genuine students take up this book, they cannot fail to follow the hint thus indirectly given. Stanley again is mentioned appreciatively (p. 52), though not without a criticism on his treatment of the great scene on Carmel. Let us be thankful for the high general excellence of the contents, and not stoop to petty criticism of details. It is only here and there, indeed, that objections have occurred to me on exegetical points. Illustrations might with advantage have been drawn from Jewish and later historical sources.² Is this a tacit protest against Stanley? The moral teaching is throughout sound and adapted to modern wants; in its historical spirit it reminds us of the late Prof. Mozley's *Ruling*

¹ *Elijah: his Life and Times.* By Rev. W. Milligan, D.D. (James Nisbet & Co.)

² I do not here refer only to legends. But see the fine poem on the Carmel scene by Rabbi Isaac ben Jehudah ibn Grat (Sachs, *Die religiöse Poesie*, etc., pp. 46-50), and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, iv. 232 (the Huns at Orleans).

Ideas. Notice in particular the treatment of Elijah's prayers, and of the Oriental disregard of human life visible in Old Testament history.

A friendly reception is due to the latest published volume¹ of the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Dr. Lumby is a good representative of the moderate conservative school. Whatever he writes will be sober as well as accurate. I think, however, that he might well have mentioned Ewald and other critical writers more frequently, if the book is to be used in colleges. I do not think "Kobolam" (note on xiv. 10) is a fair specimen either of Ewald or of Stanley. On the question of "Pul" (note on xv. 19), later information might have been given (see Tiele's *Bab.-assyrische Geschichte*, Theil I., p. 227). But, on the whole, what Oxford students call the "subject-matter" may be studied to much profit in this volume.

This volume² takes us from Athaliah's usurpation to the close of Judah's great tragedy. It is of course genially written, and judiciously promotes the interests of various classes of readers. Such books are almost more useful than set commentaries, and the more of them there are, the better. Israel's history can be read to profit from different points of view.

The Clarendon Press has here produced a work³ which it would be difficult to match for its beauty of typographical form and for the singular thoroughness of its contents. The psychological interest is not wanting. A subject, than which none perhaps in Hebrew scholarship is more difficult in itself and less connected with the interests of the great public, has inspired Dr. Wickes, who has the gifts of a true man of science, with a steady enthusiasm which has shrunk from no effort, and from no laborious journey, to gain more complete materials for establishing the rules of accents. To Aleppo, indeed, he has not gone, in spite of the high reputation of the codex ascribed to Ben-Asher; but for the best of reasons. Jewish co-operation secured, what might otherwise have been missed after all efforts, a photograph of a page of the codex, which is sufficiently clear to enable experts to form a

¹ *The Second Book of the Kings, with Introduction and Notes.* By J. Rawson Lumby, D.D. (Cambridge : University Press.)

² *The History of Israel and Judah.* Being the Seventh and Concluding Volume. By Alfred Edersheim, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. (Religious Tract Society.)

³ *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament.* By William Wickes, D.D. (Oxford : Clarendon Press.)

judgment as the date of the writing. Dr. Wickes's own opinion is that the calligraphy of the MS. is not in keeping with so early a date as the tenth century, and adds other evidence, of a perfectly convincing character, that the epigraph ascribing the MS. to Ben-Asher is a fabrication. It might perhaps have been anticipated, considering how many other epigraphs claiming antiquity for a codex have not stood the test of a careful criticism. I suppose that a long account of Dr. Wickes's book is unnecessary. Those who take it up can hardly fail to be acquainted with its fore-runner on "the three (*poetical*) books." Should this not be the case with some, the clear and succinct introduction will supply all needful information. The introduction of the accentual signs, as well as of the punctuation in general, is here assigned to the second half of the seventh century. Criticisms of our author's predecessors abound; I observe especially, in chapter ii., that upon the last edition of Gesenius in p. 15, and that upon Graetz in p. 28. Chapter iii. On the Dichotomy (or, division of the verse, for chanting, into two parts), deserves a careful study. In passing, Dr. Wickes notices the influence which parallelism has upon the division of the verses. He shows, too, that irregularities of division are not arbitrary, and that a principle can be found in each case. Chapter iii. is general; chapter iv. considers the relation between syntax and the accents. Chapters v.-xiii. bring before us in order the "distinctive" accents, with the laws for their application. Chapter xiv. examines the different kinds of *Paseq*—the latest of the signs, with a list of passages. Two most valuable appendices follow—one consisting of notes on some interesting passages, and the other on the so-called Babylonian system of accentuation. The former contains incisive criticisms; on Isaiah xxviii. 28 a good word is spoken for R.V., which, unlike most commentators, has regarded the accents in that passage.

The preface to this work¹ contains a useful sketch of the chronicle-literature of the Jews, starting from the ancient documents whose names only, for the most part, are preserved in the Old Testament. Readers of the works of Dr. Graetz (to whom on his seventieth birthday this book is dedicated) will have some idea of the copiousness of that literature. I notice this publication

¹ *Anecdota Oroniensa*. Semitic Series. Vol. i., Part iv. "Mediæval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes." Edited by Ad. Neubauer. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887.)

here because it is too limited a view which regards the religious interest of the history of Israel as ceasing with the fall of Jerusalem. Dr. Neubauer does not, like Zedner, in his *Auswahl historischer Stücke* (Berlin, 1840), vocalize and translate the texts; he appeals to advanced Hebrew students and to historical specialists. May he have encouragement to proceed farther!

T. K. CHEYNE.

RECENT OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES IN AMERICA.

DECEMBER 29th, 1886, the American Institute of Hebrew adopted the following resolution: "Resolved—that in the opinion of the Institute, it is desirable that theological schools should earnestly recommend to all who have theological study in view, that they master the elements of Hebrew, either in college or in the schools of the Institute, before entering the seminary or divinity school." Partially as a result of this action several colleges and universities are offering Hebrew as an optional to undergraduates.

An effort is being made toward the establishment of a "School of Biblical Archaeology and Philology in the East" in connexion with the "Syrian Protestant College" at Beirut. The object of the proposed school is to furnish "a centre for instruction and assistance to recent graduates of theological seminaries who wish to pursue special branches; . . . to young men preparing to fill chairs of oriental languages or to become professors in theological institutions; to travellers anxious to do something more than merely make a hurried tour through the Holy Land; . . . and to all who, in any way, are attempting to gather from the lands materials for the clearer illustration of the Book."

The past year has not been fruitful in books on the Old Testament; on the other hand, many articles have appeared in various papers and reviews which are of value, and which indicate a lively interest in Old Testament study.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.—Rev. S. J. Andrews, of Hartford, Conn., in an article on "The Worship of the Tabernacle compared

with that of the Second Temple,"¹ says regarding the theory of Wellhausen in respect to the structure of the Pentateuch: "I cannot hesitate to express my conviction that this inversion of Jewish history, advocated so strongly by many, will prove, on deeper examination, more and more untenable. It is an arbitrary forcing of history to meet the necessities of a theory of religious development, . . . taking that for progress which was in truth deterioration and decay. . . . Ezra and his helpers . . . well knew that they had entered upon a lower stage of national life, and that their great task was to strengthen the things that remained and were ready to die. To this end they enforced as rigidly as possible the law, that it might serve as a barrier against heathenism from without, and as a check upon lawlessness from within. To preserve in worship the old, so far as they could, was their duty, not to constrain the new. The origination of a ritual like that of the tabernacle, with all its supernatural elements, was wholly foreign to the spirit that animated them, and to their perception of the needs of the time."

Prof. C. H. Toy, of the Divinity School at Harvard University, belongs, as is well known, to the modern critical school, and is one of its ablest exponents in America. Besides an article on "The Present Position of Pentateuch Criticism,"² he has written "On the Asaph-Psalms"³ and "On Maccabean Psalms."⁴ He affirms that his critical conclusions, reached independently, agree in the main with those of Justus Olshausen and Edward Reuss. He holds, with the former, that the Maccabean period was eminently fitted to produce a psalm literature. "It was a time which stirred the feeling of the nation to its depths, which called forth its highest energies, and aroused it to a pitch of intense enthusiasm There would be nothing impossible in the hypothesis of Olshausen and others, that the whole Psalter, with a few exceptions, was produced during this period." He thinks however we may search the whole period from the eleventh century B.C., when writing began to be employed with some freedom, for the authorship of the Psalms. He considers the following, on internal grounds as belonging to the Maccabean period: xliv., lxxiv., lxxix.,

¹ *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, pp. 58-63. (Boston, 1886.)

² *Unitarian Review*, vol. xxv., pp. 42-68. (Boston, 1886.)

³ *Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 73-85. (Boston, 1886.)

⁴ *Unitarian Review*, vol. xxvi., pp. 1-21.

lxxxiii., lxxxvii. He also mentions incidentally that the Song of Songs belongs to the third or second century B.C.

Prof. J. P. Peters, of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, discusses Jacob's blessing,¹ and concludes that "a consideration of the historical and political allusions in [it] . . . seems to show that it is a composition of a poet of the northern kingdom, at some time, probably, between the reigns of Jeroboam and Ahab. The blessing of Moses belongs to a later period, when amicable relations existed between the two kingdoms."

He thinks "it evident that in the first half of the eighth century B.C. the northern kingdom, rather than the southern, was the seat of literary, intellectual, and prophetic activity. The intellectual life which had begun in the days of David and Solomon perished with the great rebellion, to be revived later in the northern kingdom, when the conditions of national life were more favourable to such a revival than at Jerusalem. The fall of Samaria acted upon Judah as the capture of Constantinople acted upon Italy. Israelites sought refuge in Judah, bringing with them literary treasures and intellectual activity. The result was a renaissance, and the age of Hezekiah became the golden age of Hebrew literature."

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

¹ *Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 99-116.

JEWISH CONTROVERSY AND THE “PUGIO FIDEI.”¹

THE origin of Christianity and its early growth during the first century did not attract much notice in the schools of Jerusalem. The few passages we find in the Talmud concerning Jesus and some of His immediate disciples are, as is generally admitted, of a later date, and bear the stamp of party animosity. Let us mention at once that the book which goes under the title of the “Genealogy of Jesus”²

¹ See for the general literature: 1. *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century, with an Introduction on Talmud and Midrash. A historical Essay from the German of M. Steinschneider.* London, 1857. §§ 15 and 24 (pp. 122 and 211 seqq.). 2. *Geschichte der Juden.* Von Dr. H. Graetz. 11 vols. (latest edition). 3. *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten.* Von Dr. Jost. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1857, 1859.

For the Talmudic controversy see, 1. Z. Frankel, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Religionsgespräche in der Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, iv. p. 241 seqq. 2. J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques.* Paris, 1867, i. p. 347 seqq.

For the bibliography of the controversial treatises, see B. de Rossi's *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana.* Parma, 1800, 8vo. *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters.* Texts and translation by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer. Oxford, 1876–7. Three additional authorities have since come to light, viz. David Kokhab (of Estella), Joseph Kimhi, and Jacob Tsahalon.

² תולדות ישו and other titles. For an Aramaic text see next article. The orthography of ישו, “Jesus,” for ישע, in the Talmud and early rabbinical writings is according to the pronunciation, in which the guttural ע was not pronounced, and not a blasphemous formula ימוה שמו זוכרו, as Buxtorf thought; the abridged form is a very late one. We find in the Jerusalem Talmud sometimes ישע (see *Pugio Fidei*, ed. Leipzig, p. 744; in the edition יישו). The Karaites Jepheth and Judah Hadassi (see p. 95) write ישע and יישו; they however recognise Jesus in some measure as an authority, as can be seen from the following passage, § 103 of the *Eshkol hak-kofer* (not in the edition) בני המקרא אומ' כי ישוע איש מתוקן וחכם וצדיק בדבריו מתחלה היה לפניו טריהם ומדרך צדוקים היה בלבו לנמרום ואסר נם הנירוש מהאהשה כמו שאסרו

was composed before 1241, was always considered amongst the Jews as a spurious and mischievous work, and has never been quoted by the authors of controversial treatises. It was only in the second century, in the schools of Yabneh and neighbouring localities, that Christianity, or *Minuth*,¹ was referred to by the doctors of the Mishnah; sometimes in the matter of ritual precepts² and moral sayings, sometimes in that of more or less friendly controversy. The controversial references, which are not very numerous, we shall give here, as far as they are known, beginning with the first attempts of that kind of literature, so strongly developed afterwards in the middle ages. The *Dialogue* of Justin Martyr is too celebrated for a description of it to be needed here; the Jew Tryphon however has scarcely anything to do with the Mishnic doctor R. Tarphon or Tryphon, the Tryphon of Justin being most probably a fictitious person. About the second half of the second century we find R. Eliezer, the son of José, engaged in a friendly discussion with a Christian, who argued that the resurrection is not mentioned in the law. To this R. Eliezer replied that by the repetition of the word *karath* (cutting off) in the passage of Numbers xv. 31 (A.V. *that soul shall be utterly cut off*), it is meant that a man should be cut off from this world as well as from the next.³ This kind of deduction from apparently superfluous words and letters in the Hebrew text emanated, as we know, from the school of R. Aqiba, and it was on this method

צדוקין. Anyhow the new solution of י'נ'ח 'שׁמו ויתאבר in י'נ'ח, proposed by Prof. Paul de Lagarde (*Mittheilungen*, ii. p. 290), is incorrect. The *Hithpael* form of אָבֹר is not used either in the Bible or in rabbinical writings, and syntax would require י'נ'ח ויתאבר שׁמו, or another substantive after אָבֹר.

¹ מִנְתָּחָה or מִנְתָּחָה is usually the name of the early Christians in the Talmud. It is probably the Syriac word מִנְיָא, "heretics," "heathen" (Matt. v. 47, in the *Evangeliarum Hierosol.*, ed. Miniscalchi, p. 119). They are also found under the names of בָּוְתִּי, צְדֻקִּי, פִּילּוֹסּוֹפָא when the censor would not allow the word מִנְתָּחָה. נִצְרִים is a late expression.

² M. Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 354.

³ Bab. Talm., *Sanhedrin*, fol. 90^b

that Aquila based his Greek translation. Some of Justin's arguments are found in the Midrashic literature; his argument, for instance, against circumcision, from the fact that Adam was created uncircumcised, is found in the Midrash¹ as a question put by a philosopher to R. Oshayah, who answered that there are many other things in nature which are improved and ennobled by the human hand. Another of Justin's remarks coincides with the following Talmudic passage. A *Mino* asked R. Ishmael son of José (who lived about 125–150), the following question:² “It is written (Gen. xix. 24), *Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven*. For the words ‘from the Lord’ we ought to read ‘from Him,’ unless it means two divinities.” A laundry-man, who happened to be present, asked permission to reply. He said, “It is written (Gen. iv. 23), *And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech*. Ought it not to be ‘my wives’ instead of ‘Lamech’s wives’? But such is the usual language in Scripture.” Another controversial passage in Justin and in the Talmud will be noticed later on. In one controversy, a passage of the gospel is made the subject of discussion. The following anecdote is given in the Talmud:³ Emma Shalom, the wife of R. Eliezer, was the sister of Rabban Gamaliel. There was a philosopher in the neighbourhood who had the reputation of never taking a bribe. They wished to have a laugh at him, so she brought him a golden candlestick, came before him, and said, “I wish to have a portion of the property of my father.” The philosopher said, “Divide it.” R. Gamaliel said to him: “It is written in the law given to us by God, *Where there*

¹ *Bereshith Rabbah*, chap. 11.

² Bab. Talm., *Sanhedrin*, fol. 38^b.

³ Bab. Talm., *Shabbath*, fol. 116^a (*Studia Biblica*, Oxford, 1885, p. 58).

is a son, a daughter shall not inherit." The philosopher answered him: "From the day you were removed from your land the law of Moses was taken away and the *Evangelion* given, and in it is written, *The son and the daughter shall inherit alike.*" Next day, R. Gamaliel in his turn brought to him a Libyan ass. The philosopher said to him: "I have come to the end of the book, where it is written, *I am not come to take away from the law of Moses, but to add to the law of Moses am I come;* and it is written in it, *Where there is a son, a daughter shall not inherit.*" Emma said to him: "Let thy light shine in the candlestick." R. Gamaliel said: "The ass has come and knocked down the candlestick." There are two other colloquial interviews of a philosopher with R. Gamaliel, which depend so much on a play of words in Hebrew as to be scarcely intelligible in an English translation.¹ Besides it is possible that the philosopher in the two cases just mentioned was a heathen.

In spite of controversy there seemed to be a friendly intercourse between members of the new sect and the rabbis. A certain Jacob of Kafar-Secanyah,² whom some scholars identify with James the brother of Jesus, appears to have been so intimate with R. Eliezer son of Azariah, that the latter was suspected of entertaining Christian ideas. In explaining his intercourse with Jacob, he said, "I remember meeting Jacob at Sepphoris, where he communicated to me in the name of Jesus an opinion which gave me pleasure. 'In your law,' Jacob said, 'it is written (Deut. xxiii. 19), *Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, etc., into the house of the Lord.* If it is forbidden not to employ this money for a sacrifice, may it not be thrown away?' 'What can be done with it?' asked I. He replied, 'Baths or latrines could be built with it.' 'Thou art right,'

¹ Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 356.

² Midrash on Ecclesiastes i. 8. Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 234.

said I, for at that moment I did not recollect the *halakhah* about it.¹ As soon as he saw that I accepted his opinion, he added: 'Jesus said, Coming from impurity, the produce of it will be employed for impure things, as it is written (Mic. i. 7), *For they gathered it of the hire of an harlot, and they shall return to the hire of an harlot.*' This I approved again, and was therefore accused of adhering to Christianity." On another occasion Jacob performed wonderful cures in the name of Jesus, and had to prove to R. Ishmael that it was allowed to do so by the law. R. Joshua, the son of Hananiah, had still more intercourse with the Judæo-Christians (about 150). The Talmud relates the following story concerning him.² A *Mino* made R. Joshua understand by a sign in the presence of Cæsar, that God had turned away His face from the Jewish nation, to which R. Joshua also answered by a sign that *His hand is stretched out still* (Iss. v. 25) to protect it. When R. Joshua was dying, his disciples said, "What shall we do now in regard to Christianity?" Not only R. Joshua, but also other members of his family were in communication with Christians. It is stated in the Midrash³ that Hananiah, a nephew of R. Joshua, came to Capernaum, and had some intimate conversation (about sorcery?) with *Minai*, who persuaded him to ride on the back of an ass on the Sabbath day. When he returned to his uncle, he gave him an ointment, by means of which he was cured. But R. Joshua told him, "Since thou hast heard the braying of the ass of this wicked man, thou canst not dwell in the land of Israel" (*i.e.* it is dangerous to remain with the Christians). Hananiah went therefore to Babylon, and died there. In general the Midrash on Ecclesiastes has many sayings about the *Minai*, of which the following is another example.⁴ A disciple of

¹ R. Eliezer kept strictly to the traditional *Halakhah*, and did not accept new ones from deduction.

² Bab. Talm., *Hagigah* 5^b.

³ *Midrash Koheleth* (or Ecclesiastes) i. 8.

⁴ *Ibidem.*

R. Jonathan (who lived in the first quarter of the second century) went to them, and was surprised by the master in conversation with them. [The master left the place], but the *Minai* sent after him, asking him to assist in making a contribution to a bride. He came back, and found there a young girl. He said, "Is this what Jews do?" They said, "Is it not written (Prov. i. 14), *Cast in thy lot among us; let us all have one purse!*" R. Jonathan hearing that, ran away. If this passage is authentic, M. Derenbourg says it must be an allusion to the sect of Nicolas or Prodigos in Palestine. The Midrash mentions also a certain R. Judah son of Naqoosa, who had frequent conversations with *Minai*, but no details are given about them.

In the third century R. Samlai's exegetical discussions are mentioned, about which we find the following:¹ The *Minim* asked R. Samlai, "How many gods have created the world?" He answered, "Why do you ask me? ask the first man; for it is written (Deut. iv. 32): *For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon earth.* It is not written בְּרָא, 'they have created,' but בָּרָא, 'he has created'; the same is the case in Genesis i., where the verb 'created' is in the singular after the plural form Elohim." Thus R. Samlai said, "Whenever the *Minim* attack us from Scripture, the answer is found close by." Another question on the plurality of God was propounded from Genesis i. 26: *Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.* The answer was given from the next verse, where it is said: "God created man in His [A.V., own] likeness." The same is the case in Joshua xxii. 22: "The Lord God Elohim, He knoweth"; in Psalm l. 1: "God of Gods hath spoken"; in Joshua xxiv. 19: "For He is holy Gods"; in Deut. iv. 7: "Who has Gods so nigh . . . ? we call upon Him." Some of these arguments are found in Justin.

¹ Jer. Talm., *Berakhot*, ix. 1; *Bereshith Rabbah*, ch. 8.

Origen reports some disputations with Jews concerning the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah (disputations, as we shall see, which have produced volumes),¹ as well as concerning the expression, "the Word of God." Finally, the Talmud has preserved some controversies between R. Abahu and certain Christians in the time of Diocletian, when Christianity was making every effort to become the ruling power. R. Abahu, like R. Samlai, refuted the Christians with biblical passages. He said,² with reference to Numbers xxiii. 19 : "If a man says of himself, I am God, he lies ; if he says, I am the son of man, he will repent ; if he says, I shall ascend to heaven, he will not perform it." He explained the passage³ in Genesis v. 24, *And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him*, which the Christians regarded as an allusion to Christ's ascension, as meaning "to die," a signification which the expression has in many other passages of the Bible. In another place it is related⁴ that R. Abahu praised R. Saphra as a very learned man, and in consequence he was freed from taxation for thirty years (through the intervention of R. Abahu, who had much influence with the Roman authorities). Once he met some Christians who asked him as follows : "It is written (Amos iii. 2), *You only have I known of all the families of the earth ; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.* Is it right that when a person is angry he should punish his friends ?" R. Saphra remained silent, and gave no answer ; they threw a cloak round his head, and ill-treated him. They said to R. Abahu, who appeared just afterwards, "Is this the man you call a great doctor ?" To which Abahu replied, "He is versed in Talmudic studies, but not in the Bible." "And you ?" they said. He answered, "Since I am often with you, I have more reason to consider this subject than others." "Then give us the answer,"

¹ See next article.

² *Bereshith Rabbah*, ch. vi.

³ *Jer. Talm., Taanith*, ii. p. 65^b.

⁴ *Bab. Talm., Abodah Zarah*, fol. 4^a.

they exclaimed. He said, "I shall explain the passage by a parable. Some one lent money to two persons; the one he liked, and against the other he felt antipathy. Of the friend he claimed payment by instalments, of the other he wanted payment at once." Abahu meant to say that the punishment of the chosen race was exacted gradually, in love and not in anger. There are a great many other passages of a controversial character in the Talmud, the meaning of which is not quite to the point; and we therefore think it better to omit them, since they would require too much explanation.

In the post-talmudic or Geonic literature, and in the early Karaitic writings, there is no trace of polemics against Christianity. We have even examples proving that Geonim had friendly intercourse with Christians.¹ The Karaites even recognise Jesus as in some respects an authority.² The Geonim teaching in Babylonia and Egypt, where Jews and Christians were equally oppressed, polemics amongst them were out of the question. The same was the case in Spain under Mohammedan rule. Saadiah Gaon,³ Judah hal-Levi,⁴ and Maimonides⁵ give their opinion on Christianity in their theologico-philosophical works, much as they do on Islam. In Christian countries, such as northern Spain, southern France, and the Rhenish countries, although numerously established there, the Jews were not learned enough to venture upon controversy. Perhaps there were no learned converts as yet, for it was they who provoked the official discussions. In Italy, where the earliest schools were in the southern parts, at Siponte,

¹ Haya Gaon asks an explanation of a biblical passage of the *Katolikos*. *Journal Asiatique*, 1862, I. i. p. 214.

² Judah Hadassi, in his *Eshkol hak-Kofer*, § 104 (omitted in the edition of Eupatoria, 1836, see above, p. 82); Ad. Neubauer, *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 59.

³ Tenth century, in his *Emunoth Vedeoth*, translated from the Arabic original.

⁴ Eleventh century, in his *Cusari*.

⁵ Twelfth century, in his *Mishneh Thorah*.

Bari, Trani, and later at Rome, strangely enough perhaps no controversial book was written—at least, none is known, not even from quotations.¹ Ecclesiastical authorities occupied themselves with framing exceptional and vexatious laws against the Jews, as can be seen from the records of the various Councils of Agde, Illiberis, Macon, Meaux, Narbonne, Orléans, Vannes, Toledo, and other places; but they left their books alone, and did not disturb their manner of learning. Indeed, before the attack of 1240,² of which we shall speak later on, we know of no work directed against the Jews except the treatise of Agobardus, Bishop of Lyons (in the ninth century), which bears the title of *De insolentia Judæorum*.³ Abelhard's *Dialogus inter philosophum, Judeum et Christianum*,⁴ is rather philosophical than controversial, and the controversy between king Chilperic I. and the Jew Priscus, as reported by Gregory of Tours,⁵ contains only a few sentences.

Narbonne, which was a great centre of Jewish learning in the eleventh century, produced, so far as is known, the first controversial book, most probably in the form of a friendly conversation with a curious and learned divine. R. Moses had-Darshan (the preacher), composed here a most singular Midrash, only known from extensive quotations and what is supposed to be a compendium, in which he made use of apocryphal Aramaic literature.⁶ To this Midrash we owe an Aramaic text of Tobit and of the History of Bel and the Dragon; the latter in the text of the Peshito. It is probable that the eastern schools of the Jews were in contact with the Syrian Christians, and borrowed from them apocryphal works, which they tran-

¹ See Dr. M. Güdemann's *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Italien während des Mittelalters*, Wien, 1884, in the index under *Religionsgespräche*.

² See p. 95.

³ Migne's *Patrologia Lat.*, t. 104, p. 70.

⁴ *Ibidem*, t. 178, p. 1610.

⁵ *Historia Francorum*, vi. 5.

⁶ The book of Tobit, a Chaldee text, ed. by Ad. Neubauer, Oxford, 1878, ix.

scribed and perhaps remodelled. There was indeed frequent communication between the East and Narbonne, by way of Kairwan and southern Italy. If we possessed the Midrash of R. Moses, we should perhaps find that he conversed freely with learned priests, and that some of their ideas have crept into his book, which seems to have been scarce from the beginning. In the thirteenth century a copy of it was known in Barcelona,¹ and in the fifteenth at Salonica,² but both are now lost. Don Isaac Abrabanel³ also did not possess a copy of it in his richly stocked library, nor could he procure one. At Troyes the book was known to the famous Rashi, who had received it most probably from the author himself, when he migrated with other rabbis from southern to northern France.⁴ Here, at Narbonne, Joseph Kamhi (Kimhi), the father of the famous David Kimhi, who came from Spain to Narbonne, composed a polemical book in the form of a dialogue, under the title of the *Book of the Covenant*.⁵ Only fragments of it are known, which are intermixed with later productions of the kind. A controversy is carried on in it between the Believer and the Min (or Christian).⁶ It consisted most probably only of arguments on particular verses of the Bible.

Joseph ben Shem Tob (who flourished in the fifteenth century in Spain), gives the following division of the controversial literature of the Jews: (1) The refutation of the Christian exegesis of biblical passages, such as is to be found in the treatises of Jacob ben Reuben,⁷ and Moses Kohen.⁸ (2) The refutation of the application of Talmudic

¹ By Raymundus Martini. See p. 100 *seqq.*

² By Gedaliah ibn Yahya. See his glosses to the *Bereshith Rabbah*, ed. Salonica, 1594.

³ See next article.

⁴ See *Rivue des Études juives*, i. p. 237.

⁵ *מלחמת חובה*, in *ספר הברית*. Constantinople, 1710.

⁶ *מיין מאכין*. As such it is quoted in Joseph Kimhi's grammatical controversy, with the title of *ספר הנלוי*, which is now being edited by Mr. H. J. Mathews, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

⁷ See p. 91.

⁸ See next article.

passages to prove the truth of Christianity, like the treatises of Nahmanides,¹ and some chapters of that of Moses Kohen. (3) Treatises, in which the difficulties of prophecy are pointed out unless applied to Christ; such are the disputation of Lorqi,² and some others of earlier date. (4) Controversies directed against passages of the gospel, as in the *Book of Shame*.³ (5) Against the articles of faith, composed in Spanish by Hasdai Crescas.⁴ (6) Refutations by philosophy, as in the epistle of Ephodi,⁵ not openly expressed however, and therefore requiring a commentary, which Joseph composed, and from which the present division is extracted.

We do not intend to give in this sketch a complete list of controversial treatises and notes; this would require too much space, for De Rossi, in his *Bibliotheca Antichristiana*, enumerates nearly 200 of them, written in various languages, Hebrew, Latin, Spanish, and German. A great number of them refer to the fifty-third of Isaiah, nearly all of which are given in the Catena of Jewish interpreters on this chapter. Besides, from the fourteenth century downwards, the arguments are mere repetitions, and differ only in form and division, in the titles and the names of the controversialists. We shall therefore speak with more detail of the treatises composed in the thirteenth century, and merely state the titles and authors of the most important written subsequently, with a notice of the occasion on which they were composed, wherever this is known.

Jacob ben Reuben composed, about A.D. 1170, a treatise with the title of Book of the Wars of *Yvh*.⁶ He says in the preface, that he happened to be obliged to stay for some time in Gascony,⁷ and made the acquaintance of a very

¹ See next article.

² See next article.

³ See next article.

⁴ See next article.

⁵ See next article.

⁶ ס' *מלחמות ה'*, MSS. in Oxford and Breslau (in the Library of the Rabbinical School).

⁷ Oxford MS. has נישקונייא; Breslau קישקונייא; (see Graetz, *Op. cit.*, vii.

learned priest who asked him : “ How long will you and your brethren be blind, and not see the truth ? Are you not diminishing daily, whilst we are increasing ? And how low do the Jews stand in the eyes of the nations, whilst we are becoming more powerful daily. Now I shall put you a question, and you will answer me freely.” “ He took the books of Jerome, Augustine, and St. Paul, who are the pillars of the Christian religion, and out of whose works Gregory composed his music. And after having heard his questions, I made my answers, which I give in my work, divided into twelve chapters” : (1) Philosophical and rational answers, not dealing with Scripture. This chapter deals chiefly with arguments against the Trinity and the Divine nature of Christ. (2) Questions from the Pentateuch. First come the following four questions concerning contradictory passages which can only be explained allegorically, as St. Paul and St. Jerome have done, both having been well acquainted with Jewish learning. (a) God commanded at first (Gen. iii. 16) the man, “ Of *every* tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat,” and in the following verse it is said, “ But of the tree of knowledge, thou shalt not eat of it.” (b) It is said (Gen. i. 31), “ And God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good ”; and in another passage (Lev. xi. 8), concerning the animals, “ Of their flesh shall you not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch ; they are unclean to you.” (c) It is said (Exod. xv. 24, 25), “ An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me. . . . And if thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone ”; and when we come to the tabernacle, we find altars of gold, of copper, and of wood, with precise measurements. Is it possible that Moses, the truest of the prophets, should disobey the word of God ? (d) God commanded (Deut. xxii. 10), “ Thou shalt not

(second edition), p. 488. The controversy is carried on between the מוכחד, the denier, and the צייד, the Unitarian.

plough with an ox and an ass together," the ass being an unclean animal: ought it not to be forbidden to leave the ox and ass together in the stable and on the pasture? And why is it not forbidden to plough with a horse and ox together? The allegorical explanation follows, mostly according to Jerome, and Jacob's answers come next, which would occupy too much space to be given here, besides being useless for our purpose.

As to the passages referring to the Divine nature of Jesus, they are the following: (a) Genesis i. 1, "In the beginning God created," where God (*Elohim*) being in Hebrew a plural¹ and the verb created (*bara*) in the singular, the doctrine of the Trinity would be proved. The same argumentis given from Genesis i. 26, "Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"; (b) from Genesis xviii. 1, 2, 3, "And the Lord appeared unto him, . . . and, lo, three men stood by him, . . . and said, My lord"; and (c) in Genesis xv. 15 it is said, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace," but not into paradise, since Abraham's fathers were idolaters, until the Messiah comes. The same was the case with Jacob, who said, Genesis xxxvii. 35, "For I will go down into *Sheol*" (which means Gehenna, גַּהְנֹם), as the doors of paradise were closed until the Messiah should come. Moreover Jacob alluded to the cross, by laying his hands across one another when he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh. Furthermore he says that the sceptre of Judah will cease when Shiloh (the Messiah) comes; and indeed since the advent of Christ the Jews have no king and they are without power. (d) In the second commandment it is said (Exod. xx. 3): "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any image," etc. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them," etc. How then did it come to pass that Moses made a serpent of

¹ לְשָׁנִים שְׁנִים, dual.

brass, and put it upon a pole, in order to cure those who were bitten by a serpent (Num. xxi. 8, 9), unless there is the following allegorical explanation? The serpent being the cleverest animal, and having caused the death of man, Christ, who is also the wisest of men, will save from eternal death, if we look fervently towards the pole, which is the symbol of the cross, when He rises. (e) Deuteronomy xviii. 18. It is said: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren," etc., "and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." Which other prophet but our Messiah has given precepts and commandments? (f) The passage (Deut. xxxii. 39), "See now that I, even I, am He, and *there is* no god with Me," etc., means no doubt, I am the Father, I am the Son, and there is no god with Me; I am one in Godhead and three in figure. "And His earth will atone for His people," [sic] *viz.* if we go to the other side of the sea, where the Messiah is buried and where He lived and died, our sins will be atoned.

(3) Psalms ii. ; xxii.; xlvi. 12; xlviii. 5; xlix. 8 to end; l. ; lxviii. 19 to 22; lxxii. 5 to end; lxxxv. 7 to end; lxxxvii. 5, 6; cx.

(4) Jeremiah xi. 16; xxiii. 5; xxx. 21; xxxi. 15, 22, 31.

(5) Isaiah vi. 3 ("Holy" three times); vii. 14; viii. 23 and ix. 1; xi. 1; xxviii. 16; xxx. 20; xxxii. 16; xxxiii. 13; xxxv. ; xl. 3 to 5, 10; xli. 19, 26; xlvi. 1 to 4; xlvi. 19; xlv. 8; li. 4; lii. 5; lii. 13 to end of liii.; lv. 3; lix. 15; lxi. ; lxiii. ; lxv; lxvi. 6.

(6) Ezekiel xliv. 1, 2.

(7) Minor Prophets. Hosea vi. 1 to 3; x. 12; xiii. 14. Joel ii. 1, 23. Amos i. 6. Micah v. Habakkuk i. 12; iii. 1. Zechariah ix. 9; xi. 12; xii. 10. Malachi ii. 6; iii.

(8) Daniel ix. 24, and other passages which he would not mention, since Jacob would not believe him.

(9) Job iv. 12 to 17; xix. 25.

- (10) Proverbs iv. 1 to 4; xxx. 3.
 (11) Jacob's sixteen objections to various passages of the gospels.

(12) Treats of proofs that the Messiah has not arrived.

It is remarkable how the Jews at all periods read the New Testament writings—some out of curiosity, others for the purpose of controversy. We shall see that they even made a Hebrew translation of them.

About the same epoch, the Karaite Judah Hadassi has a chapter on Christianity in his theological work, which bears the title of *Eshkol hak-Kofer*.¹ Although reproaching the Rabbanites with having condemned Jesus unjustly, he is not flattering to the Christian religion in general. Having composed his book at Constantinople, he chiefly refers to the Byzantine Church. This chapter is not to be found in the edition printed in Russia under the supervision of the censorship, just as was and is still the case with regard to editions of the Talmud and other rabbinical works.

In Paris and the neighbouring towns, Sens, Chartres, Melun, and elsewhere, the Jews were quietly settled, and often had friendly discussions with the clergy on the interpretation of biblical passages. All at once a convert of the name of Donin, which he changed to Nicolas when he became a Christian, denounced the Talmud as containing blasphemies against the Almighty, and more especially against Jesus and Mary, and obtained a papal bull, in 1239, to the effect that the Talmud should be given up to the flames. By the intervention of an archbishop, King Louis IX. restored the confiscated copies to their owners, but was forced to order a disputation between Nicolas and five rabbis, whose spokesman was R. Jehiel, of Paris. This seems to be the first accusation brought against the Talmud. The disputation took place on the 24th of June,

¹ See p. 81. It has also the title of בְּפַרְמָה.

1240, in the presence of Queen Blanche.¹ The following are the chief accusations produced by Nicolas, according to the *Extractiones de Talmut*, as regards the blasphemy against Jesus and Mary, and against the Christians:

§ 26. De Xristo etiam dicere non verentur quod mater eius eum de adulterio concepit et quodam qui ab eis Pandera vulgariter appellatur.²

§ 27. Et quod idem Ihesus in stercore calido patitur in inferno, quoniam irridebat verba sapiencium prefatorum.³

§ 28. Adhuc dicunt quod quelibet verba polluta proferre, peccatum est, exceptis que in contemptum ecclesie vergere dinoscuntur.

§ 29. Et utuntur quibusdam vocabulis quibus romanum Pontificem et Xristianitatem dehonestant.

§ 30. In singulis diebus ter in oracione quam dignorem asserunt ministris ecclesie, regibus et aliis omnibus, ipsis Iudeis inimicantibus, maledicunt.

The defence, although successful from a literary point of view, had no effect. On Friday, June 6th, 1242, twenty-four wagons loaded with the Talmud and its commentaries were burnt publicly in Paris. How many more calamities Nicolas brought upon his former coreligionists is not known. He disappears from the scene, and according to a MS. document died in 1252 by a violent death. Twenty-one years later, says the same document, the convert Paul (Paulus Christianus) arose in the south, repeating similar accusations.⁴ Strangely enough, only forty years later, we find Joseph Official at Sens, engaged in friendly contro-

¹ See M. Loeb's article in the *Revue des Études juives*, i. p. 247; ii. p. 279; iii. p. 39.

² This is one of the passages concerning Christ in the Bab. Tal., *Shabbath*, fol. 101^b; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 64^a. See on these passages, which are of a late date, Derenbourg, *Op. cit.*, p. 486. On the passage of the crucifixion of Jesus and His disciples, see *ibidem*, p. 203.

³ Bab. Talm., *Gittin*, fol. 57^a.

⁴ Oxford MS., No. 2149 (of the New Catalogue), p. 17.

versy with the Bishop of Sens and some others of the higher clergy.¹

In these controversies no use is yet made of the Agadah to prove the veracity of Christianity. This was evidently first the case in Provence, and perhaps the curious Midrash of R. Moses of Narbonne was the involuntary cause of it.

About 1245, Meir son of Simeon of Narbonne, composed a treatise on a controversy held before the archbishop of that town, with the title of the *War of Duty*.² Here the Jew is styled "holy," and the Christian "sodomite."³ It is divided into five parts, the first of which contains arguments on behalf of the civil rights of the Jews. The second part has 120 paragraphs, in which Meir refutes the Christian theories, and proves that the Jews deserve the misfortunes which came upon them, not because they observe the law, but because they commit sins against it. In the third part, Messianic passages in the Old Testament are explained according to Jewish conceptions. The fourth part treats of Agadic passages, which the Christians explain in favour of their religion, and to which the Jews assign mystical meanings. Here Meir, although believing to some extent in the Kabbalah, rejects the authenticity of the famous book *Bahir*, attributed to the Mishnic doctor R. Nehonyah ben haq-Qanah, which, he says, together with many rabbinical authorities, was recently introduced into Provence. He however does not mention the famous *Zohar*, attributed to R. Simeon ben Yoḥai. The fifth part explains the *credo* of the Jews, the *Shema* (Deut. vi. 5–10), and the passage of Exodus (xxxiv. 6–8) which enumerates the thirteen attributes of God.

¹ See the article of M. Zadoc Kahn, in the *Revue des Études juives*, t. i. p. 222; iii. p. 1 on **המקנה יוסוף**.

² **מלחמות מצוה**. See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 559 seqq.; and Dr. Gross, in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1881, p. 295.

³ **קדש** in both cases.

The most animated controversies however, which display the bitterest hatred towards the Jews, were carried on, as we have already mentioned, by converted Jews, who liked to manifest their zeal and show themselves more Christian than the old believers themselves. Such was the case with the convert Paulus Christianus, or Pablo Christiani, probably of Montpellier, and pupil of R. Eliezer of Tarascon. His Jewish name is not given. He died in the year 1274, at Taormina, in Sicily,¹ where he had gone probably on the same errand as in 1273 to Provence. Pablo, having been brought up in Talmudic studies, was of course versed in the literature of the Talmud and the Midrash. The date of his conversion is not known, but in 1263 he was already a celebrated member of the Order of the Dominicans, and was deputed to hold a controversy at Barcelona in the presence of James I., King of Arragon (to whom Montpellier also belonged), and his confessor, Raymundus de Peñaforte, with the famous Rabbi Moses ben Nahman or Nahmani, in Catalan Bonastruch de Porta.² The disputation lasted four days, but not consecutively, and began July 20th, 1263. Nahmani was allowed to speak out his mind freely, provided that he did not utter blasphemies. The dispute turned upon nearly the same questions as those raised by Donin, *viz.* concerning blasphemous passages in the Talmud against Jesus and Mary, and on Agadic passages which prove the Messiahship of Christ. Of course, the victory belonged to Pablo in the Latin documents, and to Nahmani in his own account of the dispute, the publication of which caused his exile from Arragon. The chief point which is of importance is, that the great rabbi of Gerona held the Agadah to be a series of individual sermons, which were not at all binding upon a Jew in religious matters. Modern

¹ See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 566 seqq.

² See Graetz, *Op. cit.*, vii. p. 131 seqq. Pater H. Denile in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* (Görres Gesellschaft, München, 1887), viii. p. 255 seqq.; M. Loeb in *Revue des Études juives*, t. xv. p. 1 seqq.

critics also have arrived at the same result from another point of view. Still, in order to swell their volumes, Christian divines of our time take every sentence of the Agadah as if it were the opinion of the Jews in general.

Not having quite succeeded at Barcelona, Pablo, under the protection of the king, went to the south of France, and resumed the tactics of Donin, by denouncing the Talmud, which contained, he declared, blasphemous passages against Jesus and Mary. Pablo next went to Rome, and caused Pope Clement IV. to issue a bull against the Talmud, in 1264, which he brought back with him. King James ordered all copies of the Talmud to be seized, in order that these blasphemous passages might be erased. The board of censors was composed of the Bishop of Barcelona, Raymundus de Peñaforte, and three other Dominicans, Arnoldus de Segarra, Petrus de Genioa, and Raymundus Martini. The last is generally recognised as a scholar who understood Hebrew, Aramaic, and Rabbinic, as well as Arabic. Indeed, he applied his knowledge to the conversion of Jews and Mussulmans, as we shall see later on. This passion for conversion most probably saved the copies of the Talmud from utter destruction, as was the case in Paris, for Martini wanted to prove to the Jews from their own book the truth of Christianity. Where Pablo brought misfortune and misery on the Jews between 1264 and 1269 we do not know. But in 1269 we find him in the south of France, where he tried by all kinds of vexatious means to convert the Jews, and among other causes of misery he brought with him an order from the pope that all the Jews should carry on their garments a round piece of red stuff. The inquisition was also introduced, more especially at Avignon; many Jews were imprisoned, and amongst them two notables, R. Israel and R. Mordecai son of Joseph. This latter rabbi composed a polemical work in 1274, probably after the death of Pablo, under the title of *The*

Confirmator of Religion,¹ which he divided into thirteen chapters, imitating thereby Maimonides, who reduced the catechism of the Jews to thirteen articles of faith. Its contents were as follows: (1) The three exiles—Egypt, Babylon, and the present. (2) Proof that the last exile will be of the longest duration. (3) The reason of this. (4) The epoch which Daniel gives for the redemption. (5) Proof that Israel is in trouble because the commandments are not observed. (6) That the Messiah of the prophets is a man. (7) That he has not yet arrived. (8) Discussion as to whether the Messiah is already born. (9) Of the two Messiahs, the son of David and the son of Joseph. (10) That he will collect Israel and not disperse it. (11) Of the glory of Israel at the advent of the Messiah. (12) The fall of the nations who persecute Israel. (13) Discussion as to whether the commandments and the sacrifices will be abolished by the Messiah or not.

Four years later, in 1278, Raymundus Martini composed a very powerful book, respecting quotations from the Rabbinic literature, against the Jews, under the title *Pugio Fidei*. He had procured for himself by royal authority all the books which the Jews possessed, in Catalonia at least, perhaps also in that part of Provence which was under the dominion of King James. He quotes from the following Jewish works: the Targum, the Talmud (Bab. and Jer.), the Midrash rabboth on the Pentateuch, the Siphra, Siphre, and Mekhiltha; the Seder Olam; the Midrash Tanhuma, the Midrash on Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, and Psalms; numerous extracts of the Midrash of R. Moses ha-Darshan of Narbonne; the commentaries of Solomon of Troies, of Abraham ben Ezra, of David Kimhi, and Nahmanides; Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, and *Guide of the Perplexed* (in Arabic and Hebrew); finally, the *Yosippon* and the gospels in a Hebrew translation.

¹ מיחזק אכזנה. See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii. p. 565.

He composed another book, entitled *Capistrum Judæorum*, which is at present lost.¹ We shall mention a third work later on. His *Pugio* was the standard book of reference of the later Christian controversialists in Spain of whom we shall speak presently, as well as of more modern writers who seek to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from the rabbinical literature, such as Porchet, Peter Galatin, Dr. Pusey, and other scholars. The late Dr. Zunz,—whose works on rabbinical literature, whatever Professor de Lagarde may say against him through his anti-Semitic proclivities, still are, and will remain for a long time, the pillars of it,—gives Martini the credit of Jewish learning,² and does not doubt the authenticity of the greater part of his quotations, in spite of the fact that some of them are strange enough, and many others are found in another shape, or not at all in our existing editions and MSS. The late Dr. Pusey³ followed Zunz, and so do many living Jewish and Christian scholars. Only lately however two Cambridge scholars, in the appendix to their *Commentary on the Psalms*, Messieurs Jennings and Lowe, have been of another opinion. They say: "The reader is warned against accepting as genuine the citations from Jewish works in Schoettgen's *Horæ Hebraicæ*, and Raymund Martini's *Pugio Fidei*. Both works are utterly untrustworthy. Raymund Martini (ordinis Prædicatorum adversus Mauros et Judæos, fl. *circ.* 1250) is notorious for the questionable expedients which he adopted in endeavouring to refute the Jews from their own books. With that well-meaning dishonesty which too frequently marked the controversialists of his age, he alters the text of the Talmud, Midrashim, etc., to meet his occasion, and even devises whole passages where convenient. Martini

¹ Quoted in the *Pugio*, p. 290.

² *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 287 *seqq.* Berlin, 1832.

³ *The Fifty-third of Isaiah, according to Jewish Interpreters*, vol. ii. p. xxxv. Oxford, 1877.

was a sound Hebrew scholar, and as his forgeries are generally clever adaptations and combinations from other parts of Hebrew literature, it is only by reference to the actual texts of these Jewish works that his impostures are betrayed." We tried to point out¹ to these two scholars, that many of the incriminated passages of Martini are to be found *verbatim* in existing MSS., and that the *Bereshith Rabbah* (Midrash Genesis major), quoted often in the *Pugio*, is not our printed Midrash, but that of R. Moses had-Darshan of Narbonne.² We see now, from Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's article on the *Pugio*,³ that Messieurs Jennings and Lowe were only the mouthpiece of the learned doctor, their master in rabbinic, for he reproaches them with not having quoted the master's *ipsissima verba*, as the Mishnah prescribes, in which case they would not have said that Martini was "a sound Hebrew scholar." We shall not discuss here the question if two clergymen of the Church of England are obliged to conform themselves to the precepts of the Mishnah, but we must ask their pardon for having attacked them instead of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy. He is much severer than they are on Martini, asserting that he adorned himself with a stranger's pen, Martini not being the author of the *Pugio*, but the convert Paulus Christianus. These are Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's own words: "We shall trace some of the forgeries [of the *Pugio*], bringing proof positive that they are such. We will then show that Raymundus Martin, owing to his ignorance of Rabbinic and even Biblical Hebrew, could not have been himself the inventor of these forgeries, and we shall finally show that the perpetrator of these forgeries was not merely a rogue but a buffoon."

It is questionable whether a serious journal ought to have admitted such unparliamentary expressions based on

¹ *The Book of Tobit*, etc., p. xxi. *seqq.*

² See p. 104.

³ *The Journal of Philology*, vol. xvi. No. 31, p. 130 *seqq.*

doubtful suppositions. The following facts will perhaps shake the severe opinion of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy about the authorship of the text of the *Pugio*, for we believe that Martini is admitted as the translator of it. With all his accurate and minute reading, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy has overlooked the fact that the date of the composition of the *Pugio* is given by Martini as 1278 A.D.¹ Paulus Christianus, on the other hand, died in Sicily in 1274.² Thus unless Dr. Schiller-Szinessy can prove that the one or the other date is falsified, his terms rogue and buffoon are groundless. Or did Martini keep Pablo's work in his drawers for four years? Such a hypothesis is scarcely admissible. But before speaking of the forgeries in the *Pugio* and of Martini's ignorance, we must mention two other doubtful points in Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's elaborate attack.

1. He writes Martin instead of the usual Martini; so did Dr. Graetz³ already before him. The reason is given by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy in the following words: "The name of the reputed author of the *Pugio Fidei* was Ramon Martinez, and in his convent he was called Raymundus Martin, the name 'Martini' arose no doubt from the wrongly applied Latin genitive. A similar mistake is continually made on the Continent with respect to our Castle or Castell (some-time Professor of Arabic), who is called by several writers Castelli," etc. In no early biographical work is the name of Ramon Martinez to be found. Quétif, it is true, writes Martin, but Echard in the index calls him Martini. Besides, Antonio,⁴ who is more reliable than Quétif, calls him Martini. It is possible that Martini means the son of Martin, and hence his name. At all events Martini occurs in the follow-

¹ *Pugio*, p. 395 (we quote the Leipzig edition), already given by Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.* vii. p. 163.

² See p. 98.

³ Probably on the authority of Diago's *Historia dela Provincia de Aragon*, etc. Barcelona, 1598, libr. i. cap. 2 and 15.

⁴ *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus*, vol. ii. p. 89. Madrid, 1786.

ing title found in a MS. of the fourteenth century: *Esplanacio simboli Apostolorum ad institutionem fidelium a fratre R^o. Martini de ordine prædicatorum edita.*¹

2. In speaking of the relation of R. Moses had-Darshan's Midrash to the Prague MS., Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is generous enough to admit that the *Pugio* "contains, by the side of numerous and most shameless forgeries, genuine matter"; from which we may suppose that it is admitted that Martini or Pablo had a copy of Moses' work, the correct title of which is *Midrash rabbah derabbah*.² The late Rabbi S. L. Rapoport, and after him the late Dr. Zunz, found an abridged copy of this Midrash in a MS. of a synagogue at Prague, and we call it therefore the Prague MS. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy denies emphatically this fact. He says: "Through the kindness of Mr. S. Buber of Lemberg, we have before us a copy of the so-called *Bereshit rabbathi* of Rabbi Moses Haddarshan. We can positively assure the reader that the late learned Rabbi S. L. Rapoport, in this respect, first deceived himself, and then deceived Zunz, who in his turn deceived many others in declaring the contents of this MS. to be Rabbi Mosheh Haddarshan's, although it is no doubt an early Midrashic commentary on the book of Genesis. In a general way we must caution the reader against the conjectures into which Rapoport's genius led him, against the notices of Zunz founded on these conjectures, and against the buildings reared by the idle on their idol's foundation. At all events, this so-called *Bereshit rabbathi* does not throw the least light on the *Pugio*; the only piece it has in common with it is on the death of Moses (MS. on xxvii. 17). Compare *Pugio*, 308, 309 (385)." We have been favoured with a detailed description of the MS. by our friend Herr A. Epstein of Vienna, who has made an exact copy of it

¹ Pater Denifle's article (see p. 98 note 2), p. 225.

² The Hebrew title מדרש רבה דרביה in the Oxford MS. (No. 2339, 5) others have בראשית רבת; Martini, *Genesis rabbah major or prior*.

for publication. Space will not allow us to translate (from the Hebrew) his learned and very interesting account of it, which, as we are informed, will appear shortly in a German translation. We shall only say that this MS., according to the extracts forwarded to us, contains not less than seventeen passages, many of them given *verbatim*, out of those quoted in the *Pugio* from the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan. They are on the following pages of the *Pugio*: 349, 350, 377, 385, 419, 535, 538, 563, 643, 695, 714, 728, 767, 771, 842, 850, 862, 937. The reason of the discrepancy between Herr Epstein's copy and that of Herr Buber, can only be explained by the supposition that the copyist employed by the latter could not always read the difficult writing of the Prague MS. With seventeen passages agreeing with the *Pugio*, one would rather think that this MS. throws some light upon it.

A. NEUBAUER.

To be continued.)

CHRIST'S USE OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

THE teaching of our Lord is so unique, His method and manner are so original, that it hardly occurs to us at first to seek for sources which He may have used. And yet His own testimony to the ancient Scriptures gives us a warrant for reading them through, not only for the purpose of seeing their witness to Him, but also for the purpose of seeing how He made use of them Himself. It is a labour of reverence and love to read the Old Testament, if we may say so, with our Lord's eyes and to mark its influence upon His mind. In more senses than one the New Testament is latent in the Old. It is Christ's beautiful work to bring the New out of the Old; and then to make the Old patent in the New.

We propose to examine the way in which He did this work in His use of the Book of Proverbs.

That this book would have a peculiar attraction for Him, is evident to every one who has marked the connexion between the Wisdom of which it speaks and the Incarnate Word. If we may venture to gaze into the growing consciousness of the boy Jesus, as He meditated upon His mission, daily revealing itself to Him in the light of the Holy Scriptures, we may conceive with what a solemn joy He recognised His own person in those measured words (viii. 27, etc.) :

“ When He established the heavens, I was there,
When He set a circle upon the face of the deep;
Then I was by Him as a master workman,
And I was daily His delight,
Rejoicing always before Him.
Rejoicing in His habitable earth;
And my delight was with the sons of men.”

Long afterwards it was a kind of echo of these words when He told the Jews “ before Abraham was, I am,” and spoke to His disciples of the glory He had with His Father before the world was. In the deep consciousness of His identity with that mysterious Wisdom so dimly pourtrayed and personified in the old Wisdom Book, He was able to give an unexpected turn to one of its questions. “ Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended ? ” it asked (xxx. 4), and He could say, “ The Son of man, which is in heaven ” (John iii. 13). Surely too it was in a deliberate identification of Himself with Wisdom that He said, “ Wisdom is justified by her works ” (Matt. xi. 19), for it was of Himself and His own conduct He was speaking at the time. And the echo of His own conviction is found in the Apostolic writings, which describe His person in language borrowed from the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon, a book moulded on the Book of Proverbs : “ She is the breath of the power

of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty ; therefore can no defiled thing fall into her. For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of His goodness " (Wisdom of Solomon vii. 25, 26).

We can easily suppose, then, that Jesus finding in Himself the key to the book, would read it with a special ardour. It was the compendium of the practical wisdom which had hitherto revealed itself to the spirit of His people. He would naturally use as much of it as was available, and where He could not actually use it, we might expect His language and His choice of images to be largely influenced by it. He came not to destroy but to fulfil ; and this applied to the Wisdom, no less than to the Law and the Prophets, of Israel. How He conserved, and shaped, and fulfilled this ancient Wisdom we are now to see.

There is one mark of the Book of Proverbs which affords a striking connexion with the teaching of our Lord ; that is its universalism. We could not gather, if it stood alone, that it sprang from a people who possessed a temple with a priesthood and an elaborate ritual. If it refers to the sacrifices, it is only to show their futility as sacrifices apart from the character of the worshipper (xv. 8, xvii. 1), and, quite in the spirit of the more advanced prophets, it teaches that " To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice " (xxi. 3). All the narrowing Jewish ideas are absent, so that the general tone is almost as much Greek as Hebrew. Only now and then are we reminded that the people is the people of the Law and the Prophets, as for instance, in xxix. 18—

" Where there is no vision the people cast off restraint :
But he that keepeth the law happy is he."

The Wisdom therefore of the book is singularly free from local limitations ; it is applicable in all countries and all

ages ; and if we do not refer to it often as an authority, it is largely because all its most valuable lessons have been brought home to us with greater force and clearness by our Lord Himself. This universalism of our book would make it very attractive to Him. He did not come to slight the great ordinances of the ancient faith, but His purpose was to lead us out of them into something larger and better ; and all those tendencies within the circle of the ancient faith, which looked towards larger and better things, would be sure to command His special attention. The Wisdom spoke not to Jews only, but to the world ; and He the incarnate Wisdom spoke to Jews, in words which were meant to speak to the world.

From what has been just said we may conclude that if our Lord had not used the book to some considerable extent, we should have had a very hard problem to solve. Here is the book which is the utterance of the transcendental Wisdom, the Word which in Him became flesh ; and its language is cast in the mould of a universalism which, like Christ's message, itself, looks to the whole world. Not to have used the book would have been implicitly to condemn it. On the other hand, to have been limited by it would have been to acknowledge that the Incarnate Wisdom was not an eternal necessity. We shall see that all possible objections are forestalled by the fact that the Lord made ample use of the book—we may almost say of every chapter—while, on the other hand, He hardly ever uses a thought, an image, or a word, without giving to it a deeper or a fuller meaning. No book of the Bible did He study more, no book of the Bible did He so enrich, enlarge, and improve.

In order to illustrate this, we propose to examine first of all that summary of our Lord's teaching which we call the Sermon on the Mount, and to inquire how far its spirit and precepts are anticipated in the Book of Proverbs. Then we shall glance at the images and parables employed by our

Lord in His teaching, and to see if He borrowed them to any extent from our book. Finally, we shall try to gather together some of the main points of the old Jewish Wisdom, and see how they have been embodied in the gospel.

The most extensive part of our inquiry comes first. Let us take the three chapters of the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew v.-vii., and trace in them the influence of the Proverbs. First of all come the Beatitudes, in which our blessed Lord sums up the ideal character for His kingdom. The first beatitude runs, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," or, as it appears in Luke, "blessed are ye poor," in contrast with the rich of the earth. Proverbs xvi. 19 reads: "Better is it to be of a lowly spirit with the poor than to divide the spoil with the proud." The thought is the same, though it is hardly necessary to point out how the proverbial saying is infused with a new spirit and lifted into a new atmosphere, when the Lord adds "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." In the third beatitude, which differs from the first rather in the promise attached to it than in the spiritual condition delineated, "they shall inherit the earth," recalls one of the most trenchant of the Proverbs (x. 30), "the righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not dwell in the earth." It seems almost as if the Lord, having given the promise of the heavenly kingdom to gentle spirits, wished to go back and reaffirm the truth of the old Wisdom, that the same spirit has a promise of the life that now is, an inheritance even in this world. Having noticed the connexion of the first beatitude with Prov. xvi. 19, we are led to see a connexion between the fourth of the beatitudes and verse 26. It seems likely that the Wisdom has a spiritual meaning hidden in "The appetite of the labouring man laboreth for him, for his mouth urgeth him thereto"; but it is certain that our Lord, pondering on the ancient saying would almost lose sight of its obvious material meaning, and would be absorbed in the great

truth of which it formed an apt analogy ; thus the Proverb appears in the sermon of Him who had been tempted in the desert as a hungred, “Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness : for they shall be filled.” The next of the beatitudes, “Blessed are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy,” is simply a better and more beautiful way of saying what occurs in Proverbs xi. 17, “the merciful man doeth good to his own soul,” the only difference being that the Proverb dwells upon the “quality of mercy,” which makes it twice blessed, blessing him that gives and him that receives, while our Lord in His manner refers the matter to His Heavenly Father, who shows mercy to those who themselves show mercy ; it is God’s direct doing when the spirit of the merciful man is refreshed within him. Still more interesting is the turn which is given to an ancient Proverb in the next beatitude. In Proverbs xxii. 11, we find, “He that loveth pureness of heart, grace *is on* his lips, *the king shall be his friend.*” The step from the king to God was always easy in the theocracy of Israel ; naturally our Lord would substitute God for the king, but He gives a deeper meaning to the whole thought ; we are to desire purity not because it makes our speech gracious, nor because it wins us the friendship of man or of God, but because the vision of God depends upon it ; only the pure in heart can see the King in His beauty. The last of the blessings which shows the influence of Proverbs is that pronounced on the peacemaker ; naturally our Lord, who had come “to make peace,” saw the reward of it in being called a son of God ; it was altogether a deeper and a larger thought than any which could have entered into the heart of the ancient Israelite ; but even the ancient Israelite had recognised in his proverbial Wisdom that “to the counsellors of peace is joy” (Prov. xii. 20).

The section of the Sermon which follows is concerned chiefly with a criticism and enlargement of the law ; we

are not therefore surprised that references to the Book of Proverbs are scanty ; but they are not altogether wanting. The large and generous injunction “ give to him that asketh thee ” (Matt. v. 42), is an echo of the proverb (xxii. 9), “ He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed ; for he giveth of his bread to the poor,” and even the imperative form finds a very close parallel in Proverbs iii. 28, “ Say not unto thy neighbour, Go and come again, and to-morrow I will give, when thou hast it by thee.” And that this last precept was sometimes in our Lord’s thought, appears in the brief parable of the importunate neighbour, who will not be put off by the comfortable householder, whose children were with him in bed. Again the beautiful re-reading of the ancient Law concerning the love of enemies, which is felt by us all to be the very key-note of the sermon, finds a germ, if not more, in the Book of Proverbs (Matt. v. 44, 45). It is a thought of that book, a very large and luminous thought, that God looks with an equal eye on all men, making His sun and His rain a gift to the evil and the good. The proverb puts it in this way : “ The poor man and the oppressor meet together ; the Lord lighteth the eyes of them both ” (Prov. xxix. 13). If the ancient Wisdom never got to see that we are actually to love our enemies—it was reserved for our blessed Lord to give that crowning touch to social morality—it taught very clearly that we were not to hate them, and was so far much in advance of the law to which our Lord referred. It said, “ Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he is overthrown ; lest the Lord see it and it displease Him ” (Prov. xxiv. 17). It taught, “ Say not, I will do so to him as he hath done to me ; I will render to the man according to his work ” (Prov. xxiv. 29). It taught, “ If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat ; if he be thirsty give him water to drink ” (xxv. 21). And it got very near to the great healing message of the Lord

of love, when it said, “ Hatred stirreth up strifes ; but love covereth all transgressions ” (x. 12). The conviction is irresistible that the Lord had studied long and earnestly the ancient Wisdom, and summed up in His teaching these scattered glimpses of truth, “ Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” and “ I say unto you, Love your enemies.”

Having seen the influence of our book even in the section which deals with the law, we shall hardly think it fanciful to see another reminiscence of Proverbs in Matthew v. 28. The danger of the adulterous thought, as distinct from the action which might ensue on it is already recognised in the precept, “ Lust not after her beauty in thy heart ; neither let her take thee with her eyelids ” (Prov. vi. 25).

The section of the sermon in Matthew vi. 1. 18, the rebuke of the hypocrites of the later Judaism, finds no parallel in the Proverbs. Hypocrisy is a mark of a more advanced religious period. In times of less developed piety, the temptation is to conceal rather than to simulate spiritual fervour. But in our Lord’s warning against laying up treasure (v. 19) we at once recognise the use He made of the Book of Proverbs. The Proverbs usually dwell on the worthlessness of riches obtained by evil practices : “ Better is little with the fear of the Lord, than great treasure and trouble therewith ” (xv. 16). “ Better is a little with righteousness than great revenues with injustice ” (xvi. 8). And there is one very interesting link of connexion between our book and the Lord’s teaching ; it is in the version of Proverbs xv. 27 which occurs in the Chaldee Targum, a work the substance of which was doubtless familiar enough to students of His day ; there the verse reads, “ He who gathers the *manmon of unrighteousness* troubleth his own house ” (*vid.* Luke xvi. 9). But while the first lesson of the Proverbs is the evil of unjust gain, their second lesson is the futility of hoarded treasure in itself. “ Riches profit not in the day of wrath ;

but righteousness delivereth from death" (Prov. xi. 4). "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall: but the righteous shall flourish as the green leaf" (ver. 28). And the third lesson of the Proverbs concerning riches comes very near to the Lord's profound teaching. "There is a treasure which does not fail: it is found in the house of the righteous" (xv. 6), it belongs often to the poor (xiii. 7). When this truth was seen, it remained only for our blessed Master to teach us how we should lay up treasures incorruptible in heaven.

Passing on to the injunction in Matthew vi. 25, we find a very beautiful and detailed expansion of an idea, which was not unknown to the ancient Wisdom. Catching, as we have been catching, the echoes of the Book of Proverbs in the Sermon on the Mount, we can believe that the proverb, "Commit thy works unto the Lord, and thy purposes shall be established" (Prov. xvi. 3), was in the mind of Jesus when He told His disciples to dismiss all anxious thought for the morrow, taking their place with the joyous and careless creatures of the field and of the air. And again in the great commandment (Matt. vi. 33) to seek first the kingdom of heaven, and other things shall be added, we seem to have an expansion and a translation into the sphere of our Lord's ideas, of the deep saying (Prov. xxi. 21): "He that followeth after righteousness and mercy findeth life, righteousness, and honour," which is as much as to say, that when righteousness comes first in our thought, and mercy to one another second, we shall find that we have gained righteousness as a central possession, but in her train the life, or the soul, which we had been content to lose, and the honour, of which we never thought. The third chapter of the sermon shows some further marks of our book. Matthew vii. 6 is itself a proverb which we almost expect to find in the ancient collection. In that expectation we are disappointed; but it seems as if the Lord had cast into proverbial form a thought which occurs several times in Proverbs, though in unfigura-

tive language, “He that correcteth a scorner getteth to himself shame: and he that reproveth a wicked man getteth to himself a blot” (Prov. ix. 7). “Speak not in the hearing of a fool, for he will despise the wisdom of thy words” (Prov. xxiii. 9). “Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him” (Prov. xxvi. 4). Now it seems to be just the aspect of truth presented in these sayings that our Lord wishes to emphasize when He said, “Cast not thy pearls before swine, lest haply they trample them under their feet, and turn and rend you.” The group of sayings which follows in Matthew vii. 7-12, one of the most precious and beautiful in all the New Testament, is in its form and substance our Lord's and His alone. From no ancient book could He have derived it. Yet we may see the germ of the large thought in “They that seek the Lord understand all things” (Prov. xxviii. 5). The first gift God gives to the seeker is His Spirit, and the Spirit teaches what we ought to ask.

Lastly the danger of hearing the law and not doing it, and the image of the ill-founded house, with which the sermon closes, may be discovered, germinally at any rate, in our Book. “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination” (Prov. xxviii. 9), says in a much balder and less forcible way what the Lord says in the solemn passage: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven.” And we seem to have the suggestion of the vivid picture of the house on the sand and the house on a rock, in that striking proverb (x. 25): “When the whirlwind passeth, the wicked is no more, but the righteous is an everlasting foundation.”¹

¹ Three interesting points of contact with our Lord's teaching outside the Sermon on the Mount may be added. Cf. Prov. xix. 16 with Luke xi. 28; Prov. xxi. 18 with Matt. xx. 28; and Prov. xxviii. 21 with Matt. xv. 5. The last is especially worthy of note.

The last mentioned link of connexion forms an easy transition to the second part of our inquiry: the suggestions of images and similitudes which our Lord obtained from the Book of Proverbs.

After recounting our Lord's words about the sheep and the fold, the fourth Gospel says, “This proverb (*παροιμία*) spake Jesus unto them” (John x. 6) using the word which is employed to designate the Book of Proverbs. From John xvi. 25–29 it is clear that He was accustomed to speak in proverbs, that is in similitudes which concealed spiritual truths. It is this idea of a similitude which lay at the root of the Hebrew proverb; and though a large number of the Proverbs betray no indication of it, the Book as a whole is a store-house of images brought into the service of illustrating and enforcing doctrine. We should therefore be somewhat surprised if our Lord's teaching did not betray a close acquaintance with these figures and tropes of ancient Wisdom. Of course we should be more surprised if He had been confined to them. It takes nothing from the claim which His parabolic teaching may make for originality to recognise that He turned to account such elements of proverbial and parabolic Wisdom as He found already existing. We shall now glance at some of the Proverbs which seem to have served Him as material, or at any rate as hints, of His own matchless speeches.

In the introductory chapters of Proverbs great stress is laid on the inestimable value of the Divine Wisdom, which is to be sought as men seek for treasure. “If thou seek her as silver and search for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord” (ii. 4). “The merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies, and none of the things thou canst desire are to be compared unto her” (iii. 14, 15). Following the same image—one, we may remember, more familiar then than it is

now—our Lord drew the vivid picture of a treasure found and joyfully hidden in the field, and the companion picture of a merchant seeking pearls, and selling all he has to buy one of great price, as illustrations of the kingdom of heaven. And may we suppose that as the Incarnate Wisdom read thoughtfully on in the same third chapter of the Book of Proverbs, “She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her, and happy is every one that retaineth her” (ver. 18), His mind conceived the idea of Himself as the true Vine (John xv. 1), and of His happy, believing disciples as the branches, through Him bearing the lovely fruits of righteousness (Matt. vii. 16)? Of course the image is sufficiently obvious to make it quite fanciful to search for its suggestion anywhere else than in the facts of nature; but when we have become awake to the use which our blessed Lord made of the book which is before us, we may with reverent interest recognise its probable influence on His mind even in these more obvious details.

Another familiar image in the Proverbs is that of the Way. “The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light, and reproofs of instruction are the way of life” (vi. 23). “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death” (xiv. 12). “But the path of the righteous is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. The way of the wicked is as darkness, they know not at what they stumble” (iv. 18, 19). We seem to see the Lord meditating on these sayings, and then declaring to mankind that there is a broad road which leads to destruction (Matt. vii. 13), and “if a man walk in the night he stumbleth, because the light is not in him” (John xi. 10); but there is a way, narrow it is true, but leading unto life, lit with a light too, and He Himself is at once the Way (John xiv. 5), and the Light. “Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not” (John xii. 35).

In the image of Proverbs ix. 1-6 we seem to have the suggestions of one, if not of two, of our Lord's parables. Wisdom has built her house ; she has prepared a feast ; her beasts are killed ; her wine is ready ; and she sends out her maidens (in LXX. *τοῦς ἑαυτῆς δούλους*) to summon every one in the city to come in and eat. So the kingdom of heaven is a prepared feast (Luke xiv. 16). The servants are sent out to summon all and every (Matt. xxii. 10) to sit down at the table of the King's Son. The connexion here seems very plain. Perhaps it is not over-fanciful to see in the image of Wisdom's handmaidens (ix. 3) the first germ of the Lord's most touching parable ; is this the suggestion of the Five Wise Virgins who do the bidding of Wisdom ? As another Proverb says (xxi. 20), “there is precious treasure *and oil* in the dwelling of the wise.”

If the reader is disposed to dismiss this last reference as fanciful, perhaps he will not fail to recognise the suggestion of our Lord's solemn parable concerning the Rich Man and Lazarus, in a proverb, which though not a similitude, exactly presents the outlines of that parable. “The poor is hated even of his own neighbour, but the rich hath many friends. He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth : but he that hath pity on the poor, happy is he” (Prov. xiv. 20, 21). Was it not such a saying, combined with such as Prov. xix. 7, “All the brethren of the poor do hate him : how much more do his friends go far from him ?” that led our Lord to draw the picture of the pampered epicure, and the perfectly friendless beggar, in order that He might show how much more pitiable is the first, while the last has a friend in Abraham, that we say not in God Himself ? For the teaching of the Lord's parable is not directed to unveiling a new eschatology, but to revealing the baleful delusion which besets our minds concerning wealth and poverty. And may we not add, that the tremendous picture of judgment presented in Matt. xxv. 40, a judgment in which every service

to our fellows shall be taken as done to our Lord, is an amplification, such as only Christ could give, of that striking proverb which occurs a little farther on in the same chapter (xiv. 31) : “ He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker: but he that hath mercy on the needy honoureth Him ”? (Cf. xix. 17.)

It must be on the strength of the conviction which will now be formed in the reader's mind, of our Lord's acquaintance with the details of our Book, that we shall venture to see in xx. 18, “ Every purpose is established by counsel: and by wise guidance make thou war,” the hint of the illustration, “ What king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel ? ” (Luke xiv. 31.) But few of us will hesitate to see the suggestion of the parable of Luke xiv. 10, in the proverb, “ Put not thyself forward in the presence of the king, and stand not in the place of great men: for better is it that it be said unto thee, Come up hither ; than that thou shouldest be put lower in the presence of the prince ” (xxv. 6, 7). In this instance we may almost say that our Lord was quoting from the passage. The conclusion is not so obvious in respect to a verse a little later on. “ By long forbearing is a ruler persuaded, and a soft tongue breaketh the bone ” (xxv. 15), but evidently here is the thought which is enforced in the vigorous parable of the Unjust Judge (Luke xviii. 1).

There yet remains one more parable of the Lord's which seems to have a root in one of the Proverbs; it is that of the Pharisee and the Publican. We may dwell on it for a moment in passing, as an example of Christ's wonderful power in clothing an abstract thought in a concrete form, and so making it live before us. The proverb (xxx. 12, 13), “ There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not washed from their filthiness: there is a generation, oh how lofty are their eyes, and their eyelids are lifted

up!" is forcible and true enough, but we read it and pass on. The parable in Luke xviii. 10, which presents before us the self-righteous man in the temple praying, and contrasts him with the poor publican beating on his breast, is one of those pictures which we never forget.

But speaking generally, if we have been right in tracing some of our Lord's illustrations to a source in the Book of Proverbs, we cannot fail to notice how much every image gains in His hands. Wisdom is in Him Incarnate; and the corresponding gain in concreteness and living force will be the impression left on every mind after comparing the manual of ancient Hebrew Wisdom, and the teaching of Him who spoke as never man spoke.

Before we pass on to the concluding part of the subject, we may perhaps observe the curious fact that in several passages of the Septuagint which differ from the Hebrew in the Book of Proverbs, we have words and thoughts which appear in our Lord's teaching. It would seem as if He was familiar not only with the Hebrew text, but with the Greek translation which was current in His day. For instance, in the long addition to ix. 12, it is said of the evil man, *διαπορεύεται δι' ἀνύδρου ἐρήμου*. And so our Lord says of the unclean spirit (Matt. xii. 43), *διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων*. It would seem again that the special use of *κονιάω* in Matt. xxiii. 27, *παρομοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις*, looks back to the remarkable version of Prov. xxi. 9, which runs *κρείσσον οἰκεῖ ἐπὶ γωνίας ὑπαίθρου, ἢ ἐν κεκονιαμένοις μετὰ ἀδικίας καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ κοῖνῳ*, which seems to have been understood to be a description of hypocrisy. As instances of these Septuagint renderings being in the mind of Christ, we may quote Prov. xv. 5, which contains this interesting addition, "The beginning of a good way is to do the things which are just, and these are acceptable with God rather than offering sacrifices: he that seeketh the Lord shall find knowledge with righteousness, and they

that rightly seek Him shall find peace"; or Prov. iv. 21, which runs, "Son, attend to my speech, and to my words lay to thine ear; in order that thy fountains may not fail thee, guard them in the heart." The same thought of an inward fountain,¹ we may note in passing, occurs in xiv. 27, "the fear of the Lord is a fountain of life," and reappears in our Lord's teaching, when He specially quotes it as "what the Scriptures have said" (John vii. 38). These additions of the Septuagint, we may add, not unfrequently form a stepping stone between the Hebrew text and our Lord's teaching.

There now remains to us only the third and briefest part of our task. We have to gather together the main ideas of the Book of Proverbs, and consider to what extent they reappear in the teaching of the Gospel. The broad contrast between wisdom and folly becomes, in our Lord's lips, the contrast between those who find in Him their wisdom and those who follow their own way. But within the lines of this contrast there are four ideas which recur again and again throughout our Book. (1) The necessity of inward rightness. (2) The immense importance of spoken words. (3) The need of humility. (4) The fallaciousness of material possessions (xi. 4, 28, xiii. 7, xv. 27, xxii. 1, 2, xxiii. 4, xxviii. 11, 22, xxx. 8). It is unnecessary to remind the reader of the Gospels, that these four ideas are precisely those which our Master's teaching most impresses on our minds. Inwardness, the right use of the tongue, humility and unworldliness, are the notes of the kingdom of heaven. Concerning the last of these, enough was said when we were examining the Sermon on the Mount; but a few illustrations may be furnished of the first three.

1. Inwardness. "The thought of the foolish is sin" (xxiv. 9). "If thou sayest, Behold, we knew not this: doth

¹ Cf. also Prov. x. 11, xiv. 27, xvi. 22.

not He that weigheth the hearts consider it? And He that keepeth thy soul, doth not He know it? And shall not He render to every man according to his work?" (xxiv. 12.) "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes: but the Lord weigheth the spirits" (xvi. 2). "Keep thy heart with all diligence: for out of it are the issues of life" (iv. 23). "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from sin?" (xx. 9.) Here is that great truth which our Lord "made current coin." It is the inward part which God sees and judges. "The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things: and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things" (Matt. xii. 35). "The things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man" (Matt. xv. 18).

2. This leads us to notice the importance of speech. Our Lord taught us, that we should give account for each word, because the *word* is the outcome of the heart and of the life. The peculiar significance which He has thrown into this solemn truth, we cannot expect to find in the Book of Proverbs. But when He wished to teach on these lines, there was a wealth of proverbial wisdom, which gave Him a starting point for His lessons. "The words of a man's mouth are as deep waters" (Prov. xviii. 4). "The words of the wicked are of lying in wait for blood" (xii. 6). "The tongue of the wise uttereth knowledge aright: but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness. . . . A wholesome tongue is a tree of life: but perverseness therein is a breaking of the spirit" (xv. 2, 4). "Whoso keepeth his mouth and his tongue keepeth his soul from troubles" (xxi. 23). "A man shall be satisfied with good by the fruit of his mouth" (xii. 14). "A man shall eat good from the fruit of his mouth" (xiii. 2). "A man's belly shall be filled with the fruit of his mouth, and with the increase of his lips shall he be satisfied. Death and life are in the power of

the tongue" (xviii. 20, 21). Out of this Wisdom grew the solemn warning: "I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (Matt. xii. 36, 37).

3. Lastly, that exquisite law of humility which our blessed Lord perfectly exemplified and made operative in His believing disciples; the law which requires us all to humble ourselves as a little child, to be lowly as Christ is lowly, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, finds its preparation in the often recurring warnings of our Book against pride; though it is to be noted—and it is very significant—that the ancient Wisdom condemns pride because of its ill results, and seems always to promise exaltation as the reward of humility; while our Master has taught us that humility is itself the great blessing, a blessing which brings with it only one disadvantage, that it frequently leads to exaltation.

"When pride cometh, then cometh shame: but with the lowly is wisdom" (xi. 2). "The reward of humility and the fear of the Lord is riches, and honour, and life" (xxii. 4). "A man's pride shall bring him low: but he that is of a lowly spirit shall obtain honour" (xxix. 23). That is the teaching of Proverbs; and on it doubtless He who was meek and lowly in heart often pondered, before He came forth among men to teach them the true value of humility.

To sum up, we have seen good reason to think that our Lord, in studying the Book of Proverbs, identified Himself with that Wisdom which says, "From of old have I been anointed, from the beginning, before the earth was" (viii. 23), and therefore familiarised Himself with such sayings of that Uncreated Being as had filtered down into the minds of the prophetic people; that He made use in

His moral precepts of a great number of these wise sayings, usually amplifying and improving them; and that He employed in His parables many of the "similitudes," or proverbs contained in the ancient Book; and lastly, that the broad lines of moral teaching, which appear in a somewhat fragmentary and incoherent form among the sayings of the wise, were brought into clear and connected significance in the Incarnate Wisdom Himself.

And now we may close with a suggestion, that even in the last scene of His life one of the Proverbs came up into His mind. When He said to His persecutors, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?" (John xviii. 23) did He not think of the old proverb, which His people ought to have remembered, "To punish the righteous is not good, nor to smite the noble for their uprightness" (xvii. 26)?

R. F. HORTON.

THE LAST STATE WORSE THAN THE FIRST.

(MATT. XII. 38-45 AND XVI. 1-4.)

THE Pharisees had the shallowest conception of the function of miracle. They would quite have approved the devil's suggestion that Jesus could give a prompt and convincing proof of His messiahship by casting Himself from the pinnacle of the temple and landing unhurt on the pavement below—though why the possession of a mountain-sheep's capacity for jumping should prove any one to be the greatest spiritual blessing to mankind, they probably did not inquire. They seem never to have seriously set themselves to understand the deeper parts of Christ's character, or to ask themselves whether such an

one as they found Him to be, wise, calm, fearless, merciful, mighty, was not the best they were ever likely to see. They seem to have lost the faculty for recognising excellence when they saw it. They were totally unfit to choose a leader for themselves or follow Him when He called them. All they found themselves competent to do was to come with their silly tests, and measure Him by some irrelevant and external standard. They scorned and hated Him for doing those very things which revealed His Divine greatness ; and they declared they would believe in Him, if He did such things as would surely have shown He had a poor conception of the functions of the Messiah and little competency to discharge them. Again and again they ask Him for a “sign.” To John’s instructed eye all the miracles of Christ appeared to be “signs.” They seemed to picture forth in the colours and figures of the outer world the work of Christ in the spiritual world. Each miracle was to John a “sign,” because it was to him the outward symbol of a like energy on the part of Christ in the unseen world of spirit. But to the Pharisees a miracle was a “sign” merely as evidence that here was some superhuman power; but whether beneficent or destructive, selfish or self-sacrificing, they did not care to inquire.

To all who seek a sign in this external sense, supposing that any superhuman feat is sufficient proof of the Divine presence, our Lord might say, as He said to these Pharisees : “Ye can discern the face of the sky ; ye can read there the forecast of to-morrow’s weather : but ye cannot read the signs of the times. You know the sequences of nature, and understand how certain results uniformly follow certain causes and appearances ; but you have no eye for spiritual sequences, nor understand the relation of cause and effect in things spiritual. You do not see that a superhuman marvel which makes men stare has no natural connexion

with salvation from sin; neither do you see that the presence in the world of a person without sin, and exhibiting day by day Divine qualities of character, must result in a kind of weather altogether new in the spiritual world. You do not see that the entrance into the world of such love and holiness, and the identification of their possessor with humanity, portends more good to the race than any physical marvel could possibly portend. Suppose I did clothe the sun with a cloud as ye look at it in the bare heavens, or commanded a star to fall from the sky, or said to these hills, Be removed, and be cast into the sea—there is no infallible connexion between such prodigies and the salvation of sinners. You could not from your observation of such wonders predict what would follow; but if you could rightly read the signs of the times, you would recognise that a greater than Jonas, a greater than Solomon, the true spiritual marvel, the lowliest and holiest and most self-sacrificing of men, cannot be in the world without changing its course for ever."

Some persons are fond of reading the signs of the times, and do so with no great profit to any one. But the interpretation of these signs suggested by our Lord is of another and more profitable sort. If it was impossible that such a Person as He could have joined Himself to the world's fortunes without bettering them in a fashion unachievable by any other person, it is impossible He should join Himself to any of us individually without bringing into our life an otherwise unattainable hope. If His presence in the world is the natural harbinger and augury of good to men, and more surely promises brightness and peace than the safest indications of fair weather predict it to the weatherwise, as certainly may we foretell true prosperity and lasting sunshine to ourselves if we are abiding in Christ. When we see the dust begin to whirl in suddenly formed little spirals on the road, when we see

pile upon pile of heavy, soft clouds gather on the south-west horizon, we know that rain is coming. Certain natural signs never deceive, because there is a rigid natural connexion between the cause and the consequence. As rigid is the connexion in the moral world; no man can accept Christ as mediating between God and men without receiving the utmost of human blessing. Christ cannot enter into partnership with a man without filling it with a new joy, setting it to new hopes, and forming it to the highest mould. Christ's connexion with us is the spring of life that promises infinite harvest.

But while our Lord flatly refused to work any sign as a bare and mere wonder and for the sole sake of proving His power, He in the same breath assured them that signs of sufficient potency would in the natural course of things be given them. So little were they prepared to interpret rightly His miracles of healing, and to see in them the loving signs of God's presence with them to heal and to bless, that they would actually judge Him to be endangering the ship, and throw Him overboard as Jonah had been thrown. And yet not so would they cut short His mission and His activity; but as Jonah's mission was expedited by that very occurrence which seemed to terminate it, so should His mission, by their final action against Him, receive its most convincing authentication and its truest furtherance. Their rejection of Him would result in the clearest proof that they should have believed in Him. This, the resurrection of the crucified Christ, with all its wondrous accompaniments, was to be the grand evidence of His mission.

But lest the Pharisees should justify themselves for disbelieving in Jesus until He should yield to their demand and grant the kind of sign they persistently sought, our Lord proceeds to show them that their condemnation was that they would not follow the light that shone before

them nor allow conscience to speak. What need of signs and wonders while they would not repent? The men of Nineveh had repented without signs and wonders. They had owned the nearness of God in the nearness of moral rebuke. They allowed conscience to speak, and acknowledged their sin, and repented. Even the wisdom of Solomon drew to his court those who in distant lands had a love of wisdom. They recognised in Solomon a kindred spirit and a true leader of thought. They needed no other inducement, no display of his power or evidence of his truth. The wisdom that was in him was itself the attraction. And so Christ was rightly interpreted by truth-loving men; His wisdom, His preaching of repentance, were the best evidences of His greatness: and while the Pharisees hardened themselves and would not admit the light they knew to be in Him, it was in vain that they sought to justify themselves by demanding signs.

Their state of mind is revealed to themselves by the little parable in which our Lord compares them to a man out of whom one devil had been cast, whose undefended soul was ultimately possessed by an increased number of devils. The generation of His own contemporaries was emphatically an empty-souled generation, animated by no grand positive truth, but trying to live upon negations and restrictions. The devil of idolatry had been cast out, the devil of Greek manners and Greek learning, and of gross and manifest breaches of the law; but the emptied house was guarded by no wise and strong affections. The great movement initiated by the Baptist had resulted only in some slight external reforms. The very result against which the Baptist had warned the people had arrived. They had accomplished the slight outward cleansing he required, but had not accepted that inward baptism of the Christ which would have filled their hearts with new and purifying forces. With all their profession of regard

for Jehovah, they proved themselves “an adulterous generation,” for their heart was not His, and their obedience, such as it was, arose from no strong love of Him. But to put away evil from the life while the heart is not filled with any worthy enthusiasm or love, is the forerunner of worse evil than before.

For the individual this little parable is full of significance. It tells us we may be becoming worse when to all appearance we are growing better; just as in some diseases there are periods of relief from pain and of revived energy which excite much hope in uninstructed friends, but over which the physician shakes his head, well knowing they will be followed by severe relapse. The peculiarity of the case our Lord introduces is, that, first, there appears evil in the man; then an absence of evil; and, lastly, a vast increase of evil. It is not the common case of a man going steadily from bad to worse. That is easily understood. It is easily understood that the momentum of a man slipping down an ice slope should steadily increase so long as no effectual obstacle is met with. And it is as easily understood that so long as no effectual restraint is put upon a man’s conduct, his evil habits tend continually to accelerate his downward career. But the peculiarity of the case adduced by our Lord is, that the downward career is not steadily progressive, but seems for a while to be checked, and is subsequently resumed with sevenfold violence.

The great principle thus pointed out is, that wherever an evil thing is not expelled by the invasion of a good that enters and dispossesses it, the expulsion is ineffectual and likely to be the beginning of disaster. Nature observes this law. An injured finger nail is replaced by the growth of a fresh nail, which allows no interval between the old and the new. To clear a room of bad air we do not get an air-pump and exhaust it, but open the window and let the pure air displace the impure. Every mother knows that

if she wishes her child to lay down some dangerous article it holds, the effective method is to offer the child some more attractive plaything. In the whole training men get in this world the same law holds good. The bad must be expelled by the entrance of the good, or it is not effectually expelled. If a lad is possessed with the devil of love of low company, or of polluting literature, or of any vicious habit, it is not enough to handcuff the devil and eject him by force, but the lad must be somehow inspired with higher and better tastes which expel what is bad and low.

To use religion only as a repressive or expulsive influence is fatal. If religion only serves the purpose of saving from gross sin or of making us respectable, and if it does so not by filling us with pure purposes and powerful enthusiasms, but only by curbing evil propensities, then it quite misses its mark, and leaves us worse than it found us. This is no fanciful or unimportant distinction. There are persons whose hearts are emptied rather than filled by religion. They go round all the rooms within, and where they find impurity they sweep it out. The strong devil who has possessed and used them, as a tenant his house, they summarily eject. They leave no obvious foulness that can offend the sense, they set everything in its place, and make all scrupulously clean: and the result is the stillness of death, the coldness, the rigidity, the uselessness of death. An unused room declares itself by its order, its curtains and covers all hanging at the right angle, every chair in its place, no book thrown carelessly on the table, but everything set down with care; and we should feel more at home and in greater comfort were there disorder enough to convey the impression of life. If we could visit some people's hearts, we should see a similar state of matters; everything studied and regulated with care, no great stain or soil, no dust and tumult, but no evidence of life, no proof that strong emotions and brisk activities are familiar there.

For many persons get nothing positive out of religion, no strong, impelling power, no new and abundant life, but only a death of their old life; all is restriction, repression, restraint. But absence of faults is not everything. You may have had a clerk or a workman, very bad tempered or not quite steady, but extremely smart and satisfactory with his work. His faults become too annoying, and you part with him, and in choosing a successor you are careful to get a steady or a good tempered man, one without the faults of his predecessor; but you soon learn that absence of faults is not everything, and the sloth and awkwardness and dulness of your new servant make you wish the old one back again, with all his faults and all his life and activity. So in religion, repression of sin is not everything: life is much more. And where it is not the new life that expels the old faults, worse faults, if more respectable, are sure to appear in the man. Indeed nothing is more fitted to fill us with dismay than to become aware that our religion has been merely a thing of repression and expulsion, that we have no burning enthusiasms, no love of God and man welling up in our hearts, nothing we can call life, nothing that gives us perennial interest in men and impels us to seek their good, nothing that would have made it a pleasure to us to take our place by the side of Christ, and aid Him in ministering to the diseased, the poor, the leprous, the lunatic. Nothing fills us with keener apprehension than this, for how can we live eternally if we have not in ourselves this spring of life?

And the result of using religion merely as an instrument for repressing great sin in ourselves is, that after an interval of apparent peace, the soul becomes possessed by far greater iniquities than ever. The new sins which are thus developed may not be so violent or so obviously immoral. They may be sins, as our Lord expresses it, that find their suitable dwelling in a house that is swept and garnished. Yet they

are worse than the original iniquity. They are sins of vanity, contempt of men, hypocrisy, formality, coldness of feeling, hatred of those who differ from us in doctrine and in outward forms of religion, though having more genuine love to Christ. These new tenants are prim, church-going devils, that adapt themselves to all the ways of respectable society. They do not court eviction by disturbing the neighbours, but all the while they are carrying on nefarious practices, which will one day overwhelm the house in disaster. For the man whose whole religious experience can be fairly summed up in the statement that he has cast out a devil, or, in other words, rid himself of one form of iniquity, has built his religion on regard for self much more than on regard for Christ, and therefore sees all things upside down. He cultivates his own character rather than fellowship with Christ ; and he will thus be led to become external, formal, pharisaic in his religion, and will learn to denounce all who differ from him in the externals of which he makes so much. Hatred, envy and uncharitableness, supercilious bigotry, and sourness of spirit enter into him, and make him as unlike Christ as it is possible for a man to be.

It is possible then that attention to religion may rather damage than improve the character. There are persons who have been quite spoiled by their religion ; who would have been more humble, sincere, truthful, affectionate, useful persons, had they never given any attention to religion than they are at the present moment. Their mode of dealing with religion has given birth to faults of which originally they showed no trace. Religion has in their case only served to make their last state worse than their first. It is so always, if religion does not fill the heart with genuine love for what is good, with a real hunger for righteousness, with enthusiasm for those for whom Christ died.

MARCUS DODS.

FRANZ DELITZSCH AND AUGUST DILLMANN
ON THE PENTATEUCH.

OLD TESTAMENT students are now in possession of two distinctly formulated replies to the theories which were advanced by Reuss and Vatke fifty years ago and have been, during the last twenty years, reconstructed as well as fortified by the researches of Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen. One¹ of these replies, published in the autumn, comes from the eminent Christian theologian and Hebraist, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, the other² from the famous Semitic philologist, Dr. August Dillmann. Other men of learning and piety have been working in the same field and for similar ends. Nowack's *Hosea* contains some arguments of considerable cogency directed against the presuppositions of Duhm's *Theology of the Prophets*. König's *Hauptprobleme der Israelitischen Religionsgeschichte* (already rendered into English) is a far more valuable contribution towards the same result. And among American auxiliaries in so profoundly important a polemic, Prof. Ives Curtiss, in his *Levitical Priests*, as well as Prof. Bissell and Prof. Green, have in different ways rendered useful service. What reply worth naming has yet appeared from any Englishman?

It is my business to speak of the valuable addition to critical and exegetical scholarship given to the world by Prof. Franz Delitzsch in his recent Commentary on Genesis. It will also be instructive to compare the matured results of inquiry of the veteran Hebraist of Leipzig with those of the distinguished Semitist of Berlin.

Fifteen years have elapsed since the previous edition (the fourth) of Delitzsch's valuable Commentary was published. These years have been momentous in their bearing upon

¹ *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis von Franz Delitzsch.* Leipzig, 1887.

² *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum A. T. Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josu i.* Von Dr. August Dillmann. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1886.

the study of the Old Testament. Two factors of great importance have, during this interval, come into prominence, and decisively influenced the mental attitude of Biblical expositors. The first factor involves the investigations of Kuenen and Wellhausen, pursued with marvellous persistence, research and ingenuity, and stated, especially by the latter in his *History of Israel* (1878), now called *Prolegomena* (1883), with great clearness and force. The results, as presented by Wellhausen in the sketch of the "History of Israel" contributed to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, are obviously subversive of Biblical authority; and when we turn to the history recently published by Stade, a disciple of the same school, we find the early periods of Old Testament history reduced to a heap of ruins, and the records honeycombed with wholesale historical inventions designed to support a prescribed religious system and ritual. Prof. Ives Curtiss has already in previous numbers of *THE EXPOSITOR* (February, 1886; November, 1887) described Wellhausen's theory of the growth of the Pentateuch, and the general tendencies which characterize the investigations of this school of research. To these articles we shall meanwhile refer the reader.

The second factor is *Assyriology*. The appearance of the first edition of Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* was nearly contemporaneous with the issue of the former edition (the fourth) of Delitzsch's Commentary on Genesis. Cuneiform investigation had at that time fallen on evil days. It was regarded with great suspicion by German scholars, a suspicion which lurks in Germany to this hour. No doubt this was largely due to premature conclusions,—to misreadings and consequent misunderstandings of the complicated ideographic and phonographic script of Babylonia and Assyria. But the fresh discoveries of George Smith and Horm. Rassam, and the publication of a portion of the remarkable series of Izdubar-legends, gave

an enormous impetus to the study of Assyrian. Fresh syllabaries were brought to light, and a great number of new texts were published in the successive volumes of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, edited by Norris, Geo. Smith, and Theoph. Pinches. The knowledge of Assyrian thus came to acquire a more definite form and the grammar to be more thoroughly understood. The assaults made by Wellhausen and Gutschmid upon the validity of these results were successfully repelled by Prof. Schrader. Assyriology began to be pursued with ardour at Leipzig, Göttingen and Berlin. One of the most eminent Assyriologists in Germany is the son of the writer of the *New Commentary on Genesis*. Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, author of *Assyrische Lesestücke*, and of the interesting monograph on the site of Paradise, enjoys a high and well-earned reputation as the head of an important school of Assyriology at the same university where his father bears so honoured a name. One only needs to glance over the pages of the work that now lies before us in order to perceive that the Assyriologist has made the results of his manifold labours available for the purpose of illustrating the text of Genesis. Unfortunately the infirmity of over-haste detracts somewhat from the merit of some of the productions of the younger scholar, especially in his more recent works. These faults have been exposed in the reviews from a competent hand which have from time to time been published in these pages, and also in an exhaustive article by Nöldeke which appeared about a year ago in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, and in which the writer examines Fried. Delitzsch's *Prolegomena to a New Hebrew-Aramaic Dictionary*. We note therefore with satisfaction that the combination again put forth in that work, of the Hebrew אָבָרְקָה (Gen. xli. 43) with the Assyrian official title *abaraku* is not accepted in the *New Commentary on Genesis* (see p. 469). The identification of the Biblical Paradise with

the Babylonian lowland Kar Duniaš, propounded with so much ingenuity in *Wo lag das Paradies*, is apparently approved on page 89, although on a previous page a long array of argument is devoted to the altogether irreconcileable hypothesis which combines גִּיחָן with the river Nile. In our opinion Delitzsch's interpretation of the passage is obscured by making קָדְמַת (Gen. ii. 14) = מִקְדָּם, i.e. "eastward," whereas the LXX. (*κατέναυτι*) here give the clue to the correct rendering of the word both in its present connexion and in other places (iv. 16; 1 Sam. xiii. 5; Ezek. xxxix. 11). Turning to other passages, we find that in Gen. i. 5 the "day" is still interpreted by Delitzsch in an æonic sense, on the simple ground that a solar day is out of the question, since the heavenly bodies were regarded by the narrator as not created till the fourth day. On the other hand, there is substantial agreement between Delitzsch, Dillmann and Schrader, as against the views of Fried. Delitzsch and Haupt (and probably Sayce also) that the Biblical accounts of Creation and the Flood originated from the Exile period, and were due to direct Babylonian influence. The grounds for placing the origin in times long anterior have already been discussed by Dillmann in his famous essay on the *Source of the Primitive Traditions of the Hebrews* (see Delitzsch's *Commentary*, p. 41). Most students will regret the loss of the learned dissertations by the Arabic scholar, Consul Wetzstein (pp. 561, foll.), which enriched the fourth edition (1872) of Delitzsch's *Commentary*; but they will welcome with great satisfaction the important contribution by Fried. Delitzsch upon "Ellasar," at the close of the present edition. In the interpretation of the much-discussed עד יבא שילה in Gen. xlix. 11 we are glad to see that Delitzsch, in common with Dillmann, does not give way to the false tradition of Versions and Targums, or to the novelties of modern emendators.

But we are compelled by limitations of time and space to

pass from exegetical details to another subject of absorbing interest. How does Delitzsch stand in relation to the problems of the Pentateuch and the views of Graf, which have acquired so great an ascendancy in Germany? On this subject we would willingly have seen a fuller and more detailed exposition than is vouchsafed to us in the short space of twenty-four pages in the Introduction. It is true that we have the series of essays in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, viz. "The Critical Studies on the Pentateuch," and "Original Mosaic Elements in the Pentateuch," to fall back upon. But a toilsome search through back numbers of the *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft* makes heavy demands on the student's time, and to me it is most unsatisfactory to be referred to "Suggestive Jottings" in the *Sunday-School Times of Philadelphia*, a periodical which I have never seen. On behalf of a continually increasing circle of students in England and Scotland, and more especially in America, we would venture to suggest to the author that his essays on Pentateuch criticism contributed to *Luthardt's Zeitschrift*, as well as those recently contributed to *Saat und Hoffnung*, should be collected in the form of a "Separat-Ausgabe." This has been done by Wellhausen for his own essays on the composition of the Hexateuch, and a similar volume of collected essays by the scholar and divine of Leipzig would be sure to have a ready sale. Providence owes us this counterpoise.

In his Introduction to the *New Commentary* Delitzsch makes it clear that his position in relation to Old Testament problems is in the main the same as it has ever been, and that the Bible, as the literature of a Divine revelation, is not permitted to suffer the loss of veracity and to be robbed of its historic presuppositions and groundwork. It is here that the commentator exhibits the strong side of his genius. He is more than scholar; he is also a divine. He dwells in two worlds. The world of Semitic philology

is obviously quite familiar to him. As a Talmudist and as an Arabist, Franz Delitzsch has long shown himself well equipped at every point. But he is more than all this—he dwells in the greater world of spiritual ideas. The centre of his thought is Christ and His Resurrection. Let us hear his own words: “We are Christians, and our attitude therefore towards Holy Scripture is different from what it is towards the Homeric poems, the Nibelungenlied, or the records of Assurbanipal’s library. Since Holy Scripture is the book containing the documents of our religion, our relation to it is not simply scientific, but intensely moral and charged with responsibility. We shall interpret Genesis as theologians, and moreover as Christian theologians, *i.e.* as the confessors of Jesus Christ, who is the Alpha and Omega of all God’s ways and words.” And the relation of Faith to Criticism is indicated in well-chosen words: “The Christian as such accepts the Pentateuchal history and, generally speaking, Holy Scripture, as a unity involving one spirit, thought, and aim; and this unity consists really in all that concerns our salvation and the history of its foundation; it is lifted far above the results of critical analysis. It is true that criticism, when it separates the unity into its original independent constituent parts, appears to threaten and throw doubt upon the essential oneness of Holy Scripture. Criticism, therefore, must always remain unpopular. Our Churches take no interest in it, or rather are repelled by it. In fact, there is a kind of criticism which hacks the Pentateuch to pieces like a *corpus vile* with the dissecting knife, so as thoroughly to spoil the taste for analysis, not only on the part of Christian laity but of Christian scholars. But analysis has its incontestable rights; from a scientific standpoint it is indispensable. . . . If in the labyrinth we hold fast to the single truth *Christus vere resurrexit*, we have in our hands the clue of Ariadne, and we shall find our way out of the maze.”

The characteristics which distinguish Delitzsch's present exposition of the critical problems of the Pentateuch, as compared with his opinions in 1872, are as follows: (1) A more complete acceptance of the results of Hupfeld's laborious investigations respecting the true character of the so-called Later-Elohist. (2) The recognition of the true relation of this writer to the Jehovah Prophetic document into which the Later Elohistic fragments became merged. (3) The independence of the Jehovah document and the Grundschrift or fundamental document is now adequately set forth. (4) A far more important characteristic of Delitzsch's present critical standpoint is his modified acceptance of the position of the Grafian school in its reference to the Priestercodex. In other words, the Jehovah records are anterior to the Priestercode. "Moreover, as my eighteen critical essays on the Pentateuch, in *Luthardt's Zeitschrift*, 1880-81, clearly show, the recent revolution in Pentateuch-criticism has influenced me to this extent, that I now perceive that the writer whose account of Creation begins the Pentateuch does not precede the narrator of the story of Paradise, but comes after him. I am of opinion that the historical development of Law, and the literary process out of which the Pentateuch in its present form has arisen, continued in operation till post-exilic times. Nevertheless my conception of this process is profoundly different from the modern conception." In our own opinion Christian theologians of every type, who recognise that Israel lived as a nation upon earth and subject to its mutable conditions, will have to admit that the repeated operation of the legislative and redactional process till the exilic and post-exilic period was inevitable, unless they are prepared to uphold the paradox that the Pentateuch legislation scarcely had any practical relation whatever to the ever shifting conditions of Israel's national and social life.¹ That the

¹ This does not exclude the possibility that portions of that legislation re-

Töröth both in form and substance were Mosaic, i.e. constructed on the Mosaic groundwork, is the presupposition which underlies the entire legislative scheme. Indeed we hold that the principle of centralization dates from the Mosaic era.

The constituent elements of the Hexateuch according to Delitzsch's analysis may be tabulated thus:

I. "Fundamental" document, to which Gen. i.-ii. 4a belongs. In its earlier form this is designated Q (with Wellhausen). This document became gradually extended as a work of priestly legislation, and in its enlarged form is called the Priestercodex, designated PC. It included among other portions of legislation, contained in the middle books of the Pentateuch, the body of laws Lev. xvii.-xxvi., called by Klostermann *Heiligkeitsgesetz*, designated HG, which is considered by Delitzsch to hold a middle position between Deuteronomy and the later legislation of the Priestercodex.

II. The Jehovah prophetic writer (J) with whose work the later-Elohistic document (E) was blended, forming J E.

III. The Book of Deuteronomy, called D. Chapters xii.-xxvi. are regarded as forming a complete work (p. 24). This book was edited by a writer penetrated by the spirit of the original document. This redactor is called Dt, and his hand is to be traced in other parts of the Pentateuch.

The original Mosaic elements in the Pentateuch are held to be the Ten Commandments, the Book of the Covenant, Exod. xxi.-xxiii., which formed the groundwork of the Deuteronomic legislation; the list of stages, Num. xxxiii., as well as the poetical fragments in the Book of Numbers (vi. 24-26; xxi. 17, 18; x. 35, 36).¹ Deut. xxxii., xxxiii.,

mained inoperative for long periods. Indeed, Dillmann holds this to have been actually the case (*N. D. J.*, p. 666 *ad fin.*).

¹ On this see Delitzsch's articles "Urmosaisches im Pentateuch" in the *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, 1882. Hefte iii. v. vi. vii. ix. and xi.

and even Ps. xc., are believed to come from the hand of Moses. Probably Delitzsch would agree with the argument used by Strack, that it is incredible that Israel, after their departure from Egypt, where an ancient priestly caste and priestly system existed, should have continued destitute of any written code of priestly law.

Of Dillmann's great exegetical works on the entire Hexateuch it may be said that, as compared with the work of Delitzsch, they are more exclusively philological in their standpoint. That Dillmann's theological position differs from that of the Leipzig scholar may be inferred from the mode of treatment pursued by the former; but to the Christian theologian his ultimate conclusions will have, for this very reason, a special evidential value of their own.

Dillmann is *par excellence* a Semitic philologist. Like his younger colleagues Nöldeke and Schrader (the latter were fellow-students at Göttingen), he was trained by the illustrious Ewald, probably the greatest Orientalist and Biblical exegete that Germany ever produced. The work by which Dillmann acquired enduring fame was produced in comparatively early youth, viz., his edition of the Book of Enoch in Ethiopic, followed by that of the Ethiopic Bible, and lastly by an Ethiopic Grammar which for the last thirty years has remained the recognised standard authority. The masterly series of commentaries on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua (in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch* series) are absolutely indispensable to the Biblical scholar, and are unrivalled for learning, acumen, lucidity and conciseness. Every ray of light from the firmaments of archaeology, philology, and Eastern travel is focussed, as though by a powerful lens, upon the Hebrew text. The signal characteristic virtue of August Dillmann is independence of judgment penetrated by strong common sense. Towards the fine-spun theories of the sceptical rationalist he is profoundly sceptical. In 1880 he wrote

respecting Wellhausen's theory of the successive editions of the various documents of the Pentateuch: "I can make nothing out of Q₁ Q₂ Q₃, J₁ J₂ J₃, E₁ E₂ E₃, and can only see in them hypotheses due to embarrassment." His critical standpoint is clearly and succinctly explained in the dissertation which closes his commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua.

Dillmann's critical theory respecting the Pentateuch may be briefly summarized as follows: He disagrees with Delitzsch as to the relative position assigned to the *Grund-schrift*, *i.e.* the original edition (Q) of the *Priestercodex*. The *Grund-schrift*, which he designates A, he places, it is true, later in time than the so-called *later-Elohistic* document (which he calls B). This latter work was of North-Israelite origin, and shows evident traces of an early date throughout its fragmentary remains (*N. D. J.*, p. 655 foll.). It must be confessed that there is a certain tone of hesitancy in Dillmann's discussion of the chronological relation of A to the Prophetic Jehovah writer (C). But his ultimate verdict is clearly and decisively stated (*N. D. J.*, p. 656 foll.), and has a considerable weight of evidence behind it.

Accordingly the order of the Hexateuchal documents is the following:—

B (Later Elohist) in the first half of the ninth century (*N. D. J.*, p. 621).

A (*Grund-schrift*, Delitzsch Q) is placed about 800 b.c. This nearly coincides with the conclusions arrived at by Nöldeke nearly twenty years ago (*Untersuchungen*, p. 140).

C (Jehovah writer) who is evidently dependent on B. The latter was North-Israelite while C is Judaic, both documents being prophetic in style and thought. This document is placed in the middle of the eighth century.

D (The Book of Deuteronomy) in its original form included chaps. v.-xxvi., and not merely chapters xii.-xxvi.

Dillmann with most scholars assigns this to the age of Josiah.

The collection of A B C into one work is placed between 700 and 600 B.C., while the combination of A B C with D is attributed to the early part of the exile period (*N. D. J.*, p. 682). Towards the close of this period the series of Sinai laws existing as groups of Töröth, now found in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, were adopted into the entire work. These Sinai-laws (chiefly Lev. xvii.-xxvi.) are a very difficult problem to the critic. "One cannot infer from them a definite plan or thread of arrangement. One can only say that the Law of Holiness becomes in them a main consideration" (*N. D. J.*, p. 640). Moreover in analysing the middle books of the Pentateuch it becomes a very intricate task to determine which laws originally belonged to the document A (Priestercodex in its earlier form), and which stood outside this, and formed the loose array of Sinai laws which were evidently known to Ezekiel, and formed some of the material from which his prophetic scheme of the restored temple was constructed. Indeed, as one peruses pp. 637-643, p. 686 foll., one is tempted more than once to say as Horace said to Asinius Pollio, though with a different application of phrase,—

"Periculosa plenum opus alea
tractas et incedis per ignes
suppositos cineri doloso."

Probably the most instructive and interesting portion of Dillmann's masterly analysis consists in his examination of the Book of Deuteronomy. He lays great stress upon its being the *prophetic* law-book, and the divergences between the Deuteronomic and Levitical legislation are to be explained from that very fact. The Book of Deuteronomy was not intended to be exhaustive; it was rather eclectic, and its eclecticism was due to the prophetic and hortatory

tendency which dominates its contents (see *N. D. J.*, pp. 311, 608). Both the Levitical and Deuteronomic legislation had common Töröth upon which they were based. Upon several important points Dillmann and Delitzsch are in full agreement. Among these we note that—

(1) Both lay stress on the fact that writing must have been practised in Israel long before the ninth century. Delitzsch is undoubtedly right in claiming that the Israelites carried the art with them from the land of Egypt. There is no reference to the employment of writing in the history of times that precede the Egyptian bondage.

(2) Both agree that the Pentateuchal legislation was ancient in origin, and that its constitutive elements are long anterior to the exile-period.

The weak points, as it appears to me, in Dillmann's work are—

(1) His insistence on the combination of A, B, and C into one work, prior to the introduction of Deuteronomy into the collection. Surely Wellhausen's contention upon this point has considerable force.¹ I can, for my own part, see no objection to the assumption of a combined prophetic work D B C, with which was united in later times (probably the exilic), a priestly document like A standing isolated and probably for several centuries hardly read or known. The arguments on pp. 675 foll. appear to me the least conclusive in the book. Indeed Dillmann's own remarks, p. 633, unconsciously tell against his own position.

(2) Why place the Grundschrift in the bleak and drear soil of 800 B.C.? What were the special circumstances of that era which could have given birth to so remarkable a national product—remarkable in spite of its technical phraseology, its dry methodical style—remarkable because penetrated by so exalted a national consciousness, so pro-

¹ Wellhausen, "Composition des Hexateuchs," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1877, p. 465 foll., 477 foll. See however *N. D. J.* p. 656 foll.

found a sense of Israel's greatness and destiny? These¹ are days when criticism (in the face of archaeology), invents late origins for literary activity, and refuses to believe in the existence of a pure and exalted monotheism as well as ritual before the times of Amos and the Assyrian invasions of Palestine. And for that reason I fear I shall be thought guilty of impiety towards the Higher Criticism if I attempt to revive the opinion held by Ewald, that the *Grundschrift* dates from the age of Solomon.

I am led to this conclusion by the conviction that Israel's history and literature cannot be thoroughly comprehended or satisfactorily expounded, unless we occupy our minds less with a preconceived theory of the evolution of religious ideas and ritual, and fix our thoughts with closer attention upon the intimate connexion which has always subsisted between the internal, intertribal politics of Israel and her priestly, ritual system. The history of Israel is in truth a series of actions and reactions, and its onward march is by no means a straight course. We see centralization followed by decentralization and disintegration. And with political disintegration went hand in hand the prosperity and influence of her multiplied high places, with their debased popular and syncretic Jehovah-worship. The temple of Shiloh marks to a certain degree a centralizing tendency; and once more centralization seemed on the point of succeeding at the time when Solomon's temple was erected. That a programme-ritual and a programme-legislation based on the old Mosaic Töröth, should have been drawn up in that age of attempted consolidation, and wholly or in part incorporated in a great priestly historical work, and that it should have remained a *vox et præterea nihil* after the violent political

¹ Comp. the eloquent characterization of Ewald: "Auch sonst hört man durch das ganze Werk nirgends einen Laut von Verstimmung durch Leiden der Zeit, überall vielmehr glaubt man in ihm die ungetrübte ruhige Heiterkeit einer glücklichen Sabbatszeit des Volkslebens zu atmen." (*Gesch. Israels*, i. p. 113, comp. also pp. 142, 143).

explosion which immediately followed, is surely conceivable. How deeply the attempt to aggrandize Jerusalem and suppress Beersheba and Bethel would have been resented may be best illustrated by the instructive parallel which Prof. Sayce has recently furnished in his *Hibbert Lectures* (p. 89): “Babylonian religion remained local. It was this local character that gives us the key to its origin and history and explains much that would otherwise seem inconsistent and obscure. The endeavour of Nabonidus to create a universal religion for a centralized Babylonia was deeply resented by both priests and people, and ushered in the fall of the Babylonian empire.” That the præ-exilic prophets say little about the Priestercodex is thus easily explained. Enough is said or implied even in the narrow space of the Prophetic literature that preceded 700 b.c. to lead us to surmise that it existed, or at least that its contents were known. That nothing more is said is due to the fact that the prophets cared little for priests in an age when priests were notoriously corrupt (see Hosea *passim*), and paid slight heed to a ritual that was little other than priestly. They cared much more for the Divine Love—the Divine Moral Law and for human conduct. The præ-exilic prophets were practical men, not literary pedants, and lived in the presence of the stern facts of their own age. Hence they seldom directed their thoughts to a ritual-system, bound up with ideals of policy which were no longer possibilities and which were associated in the mind of every patriotic Jew with tragic memories of bad statesmanship, blighted aspirations, and irreparable political disaster. I have no space to speak of Ezra, the divinely inspired διορθωτής, who arranged the documents, and restored to them the true Mosaic type and idea.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

AT THE SIGN OF THE BIBLE.

THERE are in the Psalter not a few pieces, whose wealth of meaning and practical suggestiveness are entirely missed, unless their purpose is distinctly apprehended. Read as mere pieces of devotional poetry, they prove stones of stumbling and rocks of offence. They reek of self-righteousness, and mantle with complacency, or bristle with truculence and arrogance. We pillory them as Vindictive Psalms, or deprecate their spirit as pharisaic legalism, and congratulate ourselves on our superior lowliness and enlightenment, who have been taught by the Spirit of Jesus. This is certainly a short and easy method with the difficulty, but it is a question if it quite does justice by the psalms. In the case of many at least, if not of all, it is only needful to ascertain their origin, and determine their purpose, to discover their justification, and feel in them that touch of nature which makes the Old Testament kin with the New.

* *
*

The hundred-and-first psalm ranks among the richest for depth of philosophic thought, vividness of interest, and capacity of practical application. Yet it is perused with hesitation by the devotional reader, and for the most part gets the go-by in the pulpit. This fate befalls it, because it is forgotten that in the first instance the psalm is not of private interpretation. Thus the author appears as an unpleasantly virtuous and self-sufficient person. He will behave himself wisely in a perfect way ; hates the work of them that turn aside ; will destroy slanderers ; cannot tolerate proud persons ; and every morning will destroy all the wicked of the land. These are, of course, excellent principles. It is well to have such sentiments ; but is it discreet, not to say modest, to proclaim them on the housetop ? Certainly not, unless—and that makes all the difference—

one holds a public position, that at once demands and justifies the proclamation. Now the very phrases that are accused of truculence prove the piece to be the manifesto of a ruler or magistrate, most probably of a king. Ewald thinks of David; Graetz of Hezekiah; and the occasion is almost certainly on the monarch's accession to the throne. The psalm is a coronation ode, and in view of the temptations, powers, and responsibilities of an absolute prince, it is a masterpiece of enlightened statesmanship, wisdom, and piety. Now-a-days we have left in Christendom few unlimited monarchies; but autocratic rule still survives in the home, in the workshop, and to some extent in the Church.

* *
*

In the second verse there is an awkward phrase, that is usually rendered, "When wilt thou come unto me?" Delitzsch makes it an expression of David's desire to have the ark in Jerusalem. Perhaps it refers to the Divine intervention in human lives in the way of aid and guidance, or in the way of judgment. No meaning has yet been suggested that suits the parallelism, and probably the difficulty is due to a flaw in the text. The poem is generally said to lack logical structure, and to be destitute of definite progression of idea. It is not the way of poems to wear their skeleton of hard thought on the surface, nor to bind their movements in a strait waistcoat of argument. Subject to this reservation, and backed by the not unreasonable assumption that prosaic interpreters of the nineteenth century are more likely to underrate than to overrate the meaning of an Old Testament saint or poet, we venture to divine in the piece at least a probable drift of thought, and to find in it a pretty complete summary of the essential principles of all just and beneficent government.

* *
*

The poem consists of a prelude (*v.* 1), and of two stanzas, of which the first (*vv.* 2–4) lays down the principles of the prince's personal conduct, while the second (*vv.* 5–8) announces the lines of his public policy and administration. Passing for the present over the prelude, we perceive that the king's ideal of personal behaviour is threefold. Against the corruption, which is the besetting curse of a despot and his court, he is determined to preserve his personal and domestic purity, especially—the turn of the phrase seems to imply—in the matter of religion (*v.* 2). Despite the temptation of kings to count themselves above law, he will govern his conduct in strict conformity with the restraints of honour and honesty (*v.* 3). In the choice of his friends and companions, he will follow the instincts of an untainted mind, and ally himself only with worth and integrity (*v.* 4). Happy the society that possesses a ruler surrounded by the wise and good, who in his own life presents a pattern of law-abiding rectitude, and secures the sweetness of the springs of social life by the maintenance of a pure court and the example of personal virtue and piety !

* * *

The principles proposed by the king for the regulation of his public action and administration are admirable. They meet precisely the peculiar perils of absolute rule vested in a single individual. He will maintain impartial, even-handed justice, and will refuse to decide any issue till both sides have been heard, and so abolish the base weapon slander, so prevalent and so potent (cf. Naboth) under despotic government (*v.* 5 a). The oppression of the weak, and despoilment of the poor by the rich and powerful he will resolutely resist (*v.* 5 b); and the need of such action at all times is clamant in the impassioned protests of the Old Testament prophets, and in the disorders and unrest of modern society. If a ruler is to keep touch with his sub-

jects, and to establish his throne on general content and well-being, he must have around him honest counsellors, and under him upright subordinates (*v.* 6). To surround himself with courtiers and flatterers were pleasant but perilous (cf. Rehoboam), and to tolerate in the public service corruption and extortion, ruinous (cf. Eli and Samuel); and the wise monarch of our psalm will none of it (*v.* 7). Finally, there shall be in his government no supineness or laxity, but law and order shall be firmly enforced, and vice and crime extirpated (*v.* 8). It is a noble charter of a good, wise, and righteous reign.

* *

*

Where has our king learned so lofty an ideal of royal right and duty? In the perception of the infinite faithfulness and everlasting justice that underlie the government of the world by God (*v.* 1). In that awful and majestic scheme he and his kingdom are a part. They have their predestined place and purpose; they have their *rôle* to play, their duty to perform, and their share in the grand *devoir*, whether they will or not. Life is not a matter of personal choice, of selfish caprice, of wayward passion. He is not a king in his own right, but by right Divine. His throne is not his own to selfishly enjoy, his sceptre not his to wield in arrogance or self-will. He too is bound, like God, to rule in faithfulness and righteousness; for he is, in very deed and truth, the minister of heaven on earth, and his kingdom is the kingdom of God.

* *

*

Hebraica, the American quarterly for Old Testament research, conducted with such spirit and ability by Professor Harper, contains in the volume just completed an unusual amount of fresh and valuable material. In the last issue a point of importance in fixing the pronunciation

of the Tetragrammaton is put very neatly by Professor C. R. Brown. יהוה' in proper names is contracted and vowelled יהי; e.g. ישעיהו, עיריהו, etc. A similar contraction appears in the Lamed He verb שָׁתַח (Exod. xxxiv. 8, Josh. v. 14, etc.), which stands for ישְׁתַחֲתּוּה. Hence by analogy we should pronounce the uncontracted sacred name יהוה'.

* *

*

In the same number there is a paper by Professor Sayce on the last prophecy of Balaam, which bristles with ingenious, not to say audacious, emendations. Among other clever suggestions a curious and interesting interpretation of the phrase בְּנֵי שָׂתָח is proposed. Comparing it with the alternative reading שָׁאוֹן in Jer. xlvi. 45, he holds שָׂתָח to be the original and שָׁאוֹן a later explanation. From the parallel proverb preserved in Num. xxi. 28, which he takes to be the model of Balaam's oracle, he shows that בְּנֵי שָׂתָח must mean the Moabites who worshipped on the high places of the Arnon. And as Ben-Ammi stands for a worshipper of Ammon, it is reasonable to conclude that שָׂתָח was a god worshipped in Moab.

* *

*

The reasoning is brilliant, but only inferential. A bit of positive evidence for the existence of the god were satisfactory. It is forthcoming. Sir Charles Warren found in Jerusalem a piece of pottery, on which was engraved, in Phœnician letters of the pre-exilic period, למלך-שָׂתָח; that is, "belonging to Melech-Sheth." The meaning of this proper name can only be, "Moloch is Sheth." Thus we would seem to have proof of the reality of a deity, whose name probably signified the *phallus* (cf. 2 Sam. x. 4, Isa. xx. 4) = שְׁנוֹת, the Assyrian *sinatu* = urine.

* *

*

In the warning addressed to Cain (Gen. iv. 7) there is an enigmatical parallelism, which has about it the look of an ancient proverb, that has had its concrete directness rubbed down into abstract vagueness. The Assyrian saying concerning the god of plague, "Nerra lieth at the gate," suggests that in the phrase, "Sin lieth at the door," the word חטאת means rather the avenger or Nemesis of wrongdoing. In that case the corresponding word, in the parallel line of the couplet, תָאשׁ, rendered "elevation," ought to be the name of some supernatural being or spiritual power. Allowing for the assimilating influence of חטאת, what more likely than that there stood originally here also in place of תָאשׁ the name of this enigmatical deity תְשׁ ?

* * *

Text emendation is a fascinating pursuit. It is much more exciting than exegesis. The latter crawls along on all fours, while the former mounts up on wings like eagles. It does not always follow however that difficulties are removed by flying over them. Still it must be admitted, that there is enough in the text of the Old Testament to provoke, if not to justify, the most daring of emendators. The original may not be recovered in this fashion, but the attempt can do no harm. Text emendation is very far from being an exact science, but even astrology has had its uses.

* * *

Three years ago Professor Otto Pfleiderer delivered the Hibbert Lectures, and disclosed considerable modifications of the theory of the development of early Christianity contained in his celebrated *Paulinismus*. The ideas sketched in these lectures have been worked out, and published in an elaborate volume entitled *Das Urchristenthum*, which will certainly attract much attention for its trenchant style and

boldness of conception. More decidedly than ever he rejects Baur's attempt to account for the Church as the outcome of conflict and compromise between a Judaic and a Pauline Christianity. Equally does he condemn the theory of Harnack, which conceives the development of Christian theology as a lapse from the apostolic norm, produced by the infusion of Hellenism into the Church's life and thought. He asserts, that the Church is the product of the action and reaction on one another of two forces—the Pauline gospel and Hellenism. This *rationale* corresponds with the facts, and proves its correctness by the liberty it allows to do justice without bias to the individual and varying phenomena of the problem. "History," he says in words of wide applicability, "is the truth God has made, dogma the truth man makes: therefore it is a vital interest of intelligent Protestantism, that dogma should be ruled by history, and not history by dogma."

* *
*

Apart from all questions of actual fact, it is an interesting and important inquiry to determine how the author of the first chapter of Genesis conceived the framework of days in which his narrative is set. There is now a general agreement among exegetes of all schools, that the notion of protracted periods and the idea of literal days would have been equally repugnant to the mind of the inspired Hebrew seer, who drafted this magnificent piece of religious faith and thought concerning God in His relation to the world and man. This impression is derived from a more profound apprehension of the spirit of Old Testament theology, a study too much neglected in former days, but must depend for its demonstration on an accurate and sympathetic appreciation of the literary character and structure of the narrative. Rudolph Schmid, in the *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, thinks that an unmistakable indica-

tion of the author's intention to have the days understood not as actual but as ideal days is to be found in the rubric—"and there was evening and there was morning." For, while in our day night intervenes between evening and morning, in Genesis i. morning follows immediately on evening, because there is no night with God (cf. Amos ix. 2-6, Ps. cxxxix.). Thus they are expressly presented as "days of God," and are not in any way measures of time either short or long. Dr. Schmid's conclusion will commend itself to the literary and religious instincts of most scholars, but we doubt whether night is omitted from the formula for the theosophic reason assigned. Looking at the rubrical character and purpose of the phrase, which surely is simply the pictorial expression of timeless completeness, why should it be inserted?

W. GRAY ELMSLIE.

*RECENT OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES IN
AMERICA.*

PROF. W. H. GREEN, of Princeton, subjects Exodus i., ii., to a minute analysis,¹ and remarks concerning the divisions made by the principal critics in these chapters: "I think it can scarcely be said that they are very plausible, much less conclusive. So extensive an hypothesis cannot, it is true, be judged by the inspection of one brief passage. . . . But we can at least say that, so far as we have seen in this specimen passage, there is not much to commend it to sober and judicious minds. It may be very ingenious, and may set forth a long array of arguments. But we have found no proof that it is true." In another brief article Dr. Green raises the question: "Is the current critical division of the Pentateuch inimical to the Christian faith?"²

While he says that "truth is to be accepted at all hazards," he cautions Christian scholars against an over-hasty acceptance of critical conclusions, and declares that "no more perilous enterprise was ever attempted by men held in honour by the Church than the wholesale commendation of the results of an unbelieving criticism in application both to the Pentateuch and to the rest of the Bible, as though they were the incontestable product of the highest scholarship." He thinks that those who have been thoroughly grounded in the faith "may, by a happy inconsistency, hold fast their old convictions, while admitting principles, methods, and conclusions which are logically at war with them." Others however are likely, with a stricter logic, to carry these critical principles to their legitimate issue.

Prof. George H. Schodde, of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, occupies substantially the same standpoint regarding the "Literary Problem of Genesis i.-iii."³

Prof. Charles A. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, continues his series of articles on Hebrew poetry, presenting the "Strophical Organization of Hebrew Trimeters,"⁴ which he illustrates by examples from Psalms xxxiv., iii., cxlviii., ii., xli., li., c., containing respectively strophes of two, four, six, seven, eight,

¹ *Hebraica*, pp. 1-12. (Chicago, 1886.)

² *Old Testament Student*, vol. vi., pp. 314-318. (New Haven, 1887.)

³ *Ibid.*, vol. vi., pp. 101-105. (New Haven, 1886.)

⁴ *Hebraica*, pp. 152-165. (New Haven, 1887.)

ten, and twelve lines. He finds examples of trimeters in fourteen lines in the story of Cain and Abel, which is given in four strophes. We shall watch further developments in Dr. Briggs' theory of Hebrew poetry with great interest.

Prof. H. P. Smith, of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, fully approves of the use of the Septuagint in emending the Hebrew text of Jeremiah.¹ Although the Alexandrian text is much briefer than the Massoretic, he claims that the very fact that it is briefer is a proof of its greater purity. He says: "A text is more likely to grow in the process of transmission than to shrink. The rhetorical expansion of an obscure phrase is more likely than its omission. The insertion of synonyms is more likely than their omission. The influence of parallel passages tends to swell the shorter form." Dr. Smith gives examples, which seem to be favourable to his theory.

Prof. J. F. McCurdy, of the University College, Toronto, in treating of "Popular Uses of the Margin in the Old Testament Revision,"² remarks: "The whole tendency of modern Bible study is to push the Septuagint to the front rank as a companion-book to the Hebrew Bible. . . . It will not then have been in vain that such a scholar as Lagarde has spent the best hours of a busy life in gathering and sifting materials for a worthy text of a work which, after the neglect and depreciation of many centuries, is destined to rule in no small measure the realm of Old Testament study and research."

President Alvah Hovey, of Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass., in his article on "Shekhar and Leaven in Mosaic Offerings,"³ successfully defends the Revised Version against the ignorant aspersions of a writer in the *National Temperance Advocate*.

Prof. Francis Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, contributes a valuable article concerning the "Commentaries on Exodus";⁴ and Prof. E. C. Mitchell, of Cambridge, Mass., gives "The Bibliography of Exploration,"⁵ limiting it however to American writers, and enlarging the scope so as to include biblical archaeology.

In Prof. D. S. Lyon's interesting article on "Israelitish Politics

¹ *Hebraica*, pp. 193-200.

² *Old Testament Student*, pp. 225, 234. (New Haven, 1887.)

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-16. ⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-92. ⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 303-315.

as Affected by Assyrian, Babylonian, and early Achaemenian Kings,"¹ we see a tendency to the naturalism of the modern critical school.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL LITERATURE.—The international system of Sunday-school lessons has given a powerful impulse to the study of the Bible, which has borne good fruit in various writings.

The *Sunday-school Times* of Philadelphia, under the editorial management of Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, has gathered a remarkable array of contributors, considering the object of the journal. Such names as those of Delitzsch, Driver, and Green are found among them. Prof. Driver began to contribute "Critical Notes on the International Sunday-school Lessons," in which he set forth the "indications of different documents in the Pentateuch." After the publication of an introductory article, and papers on the first four lessons, so many protests were received, that the series was discontinued, although it was afterwards published in pamphlet form.²

Two works, which were doubtless suggested by the topics demanding such general interest, really belong to another category.

One is a series of twelve Sunday lectures on *The Pharaohs of the Bondage and the Exodus*³ by Rev. Charles T. Robinson, of New York. It is based on the latest studies in Egyptology, and contains much interesting information in homiletical form.

The other, entitled *Abraham, Joseph, and Moses in Egypt*,⁴ is a course of six lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., by Rev. A. H. Kellogg, of Philadelphia. He maintains that Thothmes III. is "the Pharaoh of Joseph's elevation." He gives up the view that Merneptah⁵ was the Pharaoh of the exodus, but holds that "he was either Mineptah Seti II. or Mineptah Siptah."

EXEGESIS.—We place under this heading Bartlett and Peters' *Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian, Arranged and Edited for Young Readers as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible*. It is really "Hebrew story from creation to the exile," and for the

¹ *Old Testament Studies*, pp. 293-302.

² New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887, pp. 85.

³ The Century Company, New York, 1887.

⁴ A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York, 1887.

⁵ Weidmann, *Aegyptische Geschichte* (Gotha, 1884), 2 Teil, p. 193, considers that the powerful character of Egypt in the reign of this monarch makes such flight almost impossible; but he overlooks God's miraculous intervention.

most part follows the wording of the Authorized Version, or the Revision, although changes are noticeable. At the same time the critical views of the authors are easily discernible. In the account of the flood they have taken the narrative of the Jahvist, but have not combined that of the Elohist. So too they seem to have followed the text of the Septuagint in the omission of 1 Samuel xvii. 12-31 and 55-xviii. 5, etc.

HISTORY.—Three books have been issued in Putnam's series, "The Story of the Nations,"¹ which are helpful in the study of Old Testament history. Two are by a talented Russian lady, Zénaïde A. Ragozin; one on Chaldæa, the other on Assyria. She gives a list of the most important works bearing on the subjects discussed in the two volumes, which seems to include everything of value until the time of publication. Rawlinson's *Story of Egypt* belongs to the same series. All these volumes are written in an attractive style, and although designed for a younger class of readers, furnish useful information to all who have neither the time nor the disposition to study larger and more expensive works.

THEOLOGY.—Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*² is an important contribution to Old Testament theology. While admitting the main positions of the modern critical school regarding the origin and age of various parts of the Old Testament Scriptures, his treatment of the Old Testament is reverential and sympathetic. He says: "There is but one legitimate method for the interpretation of prophecy; and that is, (1) to study each prediction by itself with the most patient criticism and painstaking exegesis in all its details; (2) to study it in relation to other predictions in the series, and note the organic connexion; (3) to study it in relation to Christ and His redemption." Even those who do not accept the critical views of Dr. Briggs will find the book instructive and stimulating.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

¹ G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

² Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1876.

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

AMONG the papers on special passages which have appeared in our magazines, the first mention belongs of right to the delightful paper on "The Disciple whom Jesus Loved," by Dr. Woolsey.¹ With him the quiet years have gathered honey; and whatever he gives us is freighted with the fruits of long meditation. In this paper we scarcely know whether to admire most its careful and exact scholarship, or its tender glow of thoughtfulness. Its fulness defies analysis. Perhaps, however, the kernel is to be found in the discussion of ἀγαπάω and φιλέω, and the application of its results to the passages treated. In general, Dr. Woolsey agrees with Dr. Trench in the distinguishing of the two words, but very justly corrects his application of the distinction in xxi. 15 seq. Dr. Trench supposes that Peter chose φιλέω because ἀγαπάω sounded too cold for his warmth of personal affection. "May we not rather consider it," says Dr. Woolsey, "to be more probable that Peter felt his love to Christ to be too human, too much like a friend's love to a friend, and ventured not on this solemn occasion to give it the name more [sic] appropriate to a love such as did not reach the point of ἀγαπή? Hence it is humility and a feeling of unworthiness which leads Peter to choose another expression; that one which his consciousness and conduct might both justify." Readers of Principal Edwards' interesting paper on "Testament or Covenant?" in the EXPOSITOR, will turn with interest to a careful discussion of the same problem by Dr. F. Gardiner.² He too concludes for "covenant," but takes διαθήμερος to refer to the victim not in a passive, mediative, or substitutive sense, but somewhat pregnantly as that which "makes" the covenant in the sense of "ratifies," or "confirms," as we may say the seal makes the bond. In the same journal, Prof. D. R. Goodwin convincingly argues that "and," in Heb. x. 38, is no part of the quotation, and should be printed accordingly (pp. 84-5). And in

¹ "The Disciple whom Jesus Loved: with some remarks on the passages where these words are used." By Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., in the *Andover Review*, August, 1885. Pp. 163-185.

² On διαθήκη in Heb. ix. 16, 17, in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1885. (Boston: 1886. Pp. 8-19.)

an earlier number Prof. Genung¹ elucidates Rom. x. 4-11. Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine gives us, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1885, pp. 565-568, a new interpretation of the crux of Gal. iii. 16, the hinge of which is to take "who is Christ" not of the individual person "Christ," but of the collective body, "*Christ and His children*"; and thus see in Paul's understanding of עֵבֶן, not one individual, but one body of seed as distinguished from other bodies of seed, *i.e.* Israel according to the promise as distinguished from Israel according to the flesh.

We have crossed the line into the sphere of Biblical Theology when we come to Dr. Stevens' paper on "The Pauline Theology of the Law,"² a very suggestive discussion, although we do not think the author sufficiently feels the *nuances* of Paul's usage of *rōmos* without the article. It will not be necessary to do more than mention the fact that a new edition of Dr. Joseph P. Thompson's *The Theology of Christ*³ has appeared. Place must be found for a similar mere mention of Dr. S. T. Lowrie's translation of Cremer's *Beyond the Grave*,⁴ to which he has prefixed an introduction by Dr. A. A. Hodge, which is more valuable than the original.

By the side of this book must be placed another conceived in a similar spirit—Dr. Wm. H. Furness's "The Story of the Resurrection of Christ, with some additional remarks on the character of Christ, and the Historical Claims of the Four Gospels."⁵ He too honours Christ, and believes in the reality of His resurrection, but denies to Him that Deity which give His life and death and resurrection their saving power. Perhaps this thorough apologetic of the resurrection is, however, all the more interesting because of the standpoint of the author.

Among works of a somewhat apologetic character, we may mention Dr. B. Pick's paper on *The Talmud, a Witness to Christ and Christianity*,⁶ in which he gathers a number of passages from the Talmud testifying to the existence of Christianity or of the Christian teaching or books in the early centuries. Here, too, attention should be called to Dr. S. H. Kellogg's⁷ comparison of

¹ *Journal, etc.*, for 1884. (Boston: 1885. Pp. 29-36.)

² *The Baptist Quarterly Review*. (New York: April, 1886. Pp. 189-200.)

³ New York: E. B. Treat. 12mo, pp. xvi., 206.

⁴ New York: Harper & Bros., 1886. 16mo, pp. xxxviii., 153.

⁵ Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

⁶ *The Lutheran Church Review*, 1886. Pp. 121-141.

⁷ *The Light of Asia and the Light of the World, etc.* By S. H. Kellogg, D.D. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885. 8vo, pp. xviii., 390.)

Christianity and Buddhism, in their records, stories, doctrines, and ethics. In the former part of the book the literary relation of the Gospels to Buddhism is carefully examined, and Seydel's book, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinem Verhältnissen zu Buddha—Sage und Buddha-Lehre* (1880), is followed step by step to its refutation. Elsewhere it touches in a like apologetic interest on New Testament theology and New Testament ethics.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

My purpose in the following series of papers is to expound the Epistle to the Hebrews, or the larger portion of it, in relation to its leading idea, or distinctive conception of the Christian religion. The main object of this introductory paper, therefore, must be to state what that central idea is. But as this question is closely connected with another, viz. what was the religious condition of the first readers, and that again to a certain subordinate extent with a third, viz. who were the first readers, it will be expedient to approach the main question by a brief preliminary discussion of the other two.

1. Who were the first readers? The title of the writing in the most ancient MSS. is *to the Hebrews*, and even if, with some, we should question its originality and regard it as a prefix by a later hand, the destination of the writing would still be tolerably certain from its contents. It is obviously a book written for the special benefit of Christians of Jewish descent and accustomed to Jewish religious institutions. The only question that can be raised is whether the Epistle, for such from its close it appears to have been, was intended to be a circular letter for Hebrew Christians in all parts of the world, or for a particular community settled in one place. Opinion preponderates in favour of the latter alternative, and there are some things in the Epistle which seem to show that it is the correct one. In the closing chapter we find the writer asking his readers to

pray for him that he may be restored to them the sooner;¹ and informing them that brother Timothy is set at liberty, and that he hopes soon to visit them along with him.² In the last sentence but one he sends salutations to them from certain brethren who were natives of Italy. “Those of (or from) Italy salute you.”³ These requests, notices, and salutations, imply an acquaintance with the writer, with Timothy, and with Italian Christians, such as could hardly be possessed by all Jewish Christians.

But if the Hebrews to whom the Epistle is addressed were a special community, where did they reside? In Palestine, and more particularly in Jerusalem, according to ancient patristic opinion, and the fact is of itself a presumption in favour of the hypothesis. The opinion of the ancients, if not based on a certain historical tradition, may at least be regarded as a good guess. But the main argument in favour of Jerusalem is one of which the full force cannot be felt till the second question I propose to consider has been answered. Meanwhile it can be briefly stated. The Epistle in its whole contents implies a very grave situation. Those to whom it is addressed are in danger of apostasy, not merely from outward tribulation, but even more from a reactionary state of mind. The evidence of reaction is the pains taken to meet it by an exhibition of the nature and excellence of the Christian religion in comparison with the Levitical. Now this state of mind was more likely to be found in Palestine, and in Jerusalem above all, than anywhere else; especially if, as may be inferred from some things in the Epistle, the temple was still standing and the temple worship was still going on when it was written. Jerusalem was the home of Jewish conservatism, and all the influences there tended to develop and strengthen even in Christian circles a reactionary spirit. It is this consideration which tells in favour of the Jeru-

¹ xiii. 18, 19.

² xiii. 23.

³ xiii. 24

salem hypothesis as against its Alexandrian rival. In the neighbourhood of Alexandria, at Leontopolis, there was a temple where Jews resident in Egypt might worship, which outlasted the temple at Jerusalem by one or two years. In so far, therefore, as anything in the Epistle implies the present practice of temple worship, that part of the problem might be met as well by Alexandria as by Jerusalem. But the religious atmosphere of Alexandria was less conservative than that of Jerusalem. There one might expect to find in the Christian community a type of thought more in sympathy with that of the writer of our Epistle. For such readers such a writing was not needed. To outward trial they might be exposed, but in absence of the more serious inward trial there was no occasion for so elaborate an apology for the Christian faith.

Objections to the Jerusalem hypothesis have been stated, which to not a few modern scholars have appeared insuperable. Perhaps the most formidable is the language in which the Epistle is written. If it was addressed to the Church in the Holy City, why was it not written in Aramaic, the language with which they were most familiar? In ancient times this difficulty was met by the suggestion that the Epistle was originally written in the Hebrew tongue, and then translated into Greek. This opinion, as held by Clement of Alexandria and others, was merely a device to get over the stylistic objections to Pauline authorship and the linguistic objections to Palestinian readers. If the Epistle was written originally in Hebrew it might be Paul's though the Greek is not his, and it might be meant for Jews in Jerusalem as its first readers, though they understood Greek with difficulty or not at all. The hypothesis has nothing besides to recommend it; for no one reading the Epistle and noting the fluent style of the Greek, and the original cast both of thought and expression, will readily acquiesce in the view that what we have here is a translation

out of another tongue, so entirely different in structure, of the thoughts of another mind. The simplest solution of the difficulty in question is, that the writer of the Epistle used the language which he had at command. A Hellenist, he wrote in Greek, hoping to be understood by his readers sufficiently well, if not perfectly.

The other objections are less weighty. One is an inference based on chapter ii. 3, that the writer thinks of his readers as residing in a land in which Christ Himself had not personally taught. But we are not shut up to this interpretation. The statement in the text cited does not necessarily mean more than this, that the writer and his readers belonged to a generation which had not enjoyed the benefit of Christ's personal ministry, but had been indebted for instruction in Christianity to His disciples. Another objection is also based on a misunderstanding of a statement in the Epistle, that contained in chapter xii. 4: "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood striving against sin." This is taken to mean, "your Church has not yet had any martyrs," it being assumed that the writer views the Church as a moral person, and speaks of its whole past history. It is more in accordance with the practical purpose of the statement to assume that the writer is thinking only of those who shall actually read his Epistle, and means to say, Ye have not yet had to suffer persecution in the extreme form, why lose heart?

The objection based on the allusion, at the close of the Epistle, to Timothy, is an argument *ex ignorantia*. We do not know what relations may have subsisted between Timothy and the Palestine Churches; and therefore are not entitled, on the ground of the implied relation, to deny a Palestinian destination.

Notwithstanding all that has been urged against it, then, I hold to the view entertained by the ancients, and powerfully advocated in the masterly work of Bleek, that the

Hebrews to whom the Epistle was first addressed were resident in Palestine, or more definitely in Jerusalem. All that has been said against it admits of reply, and all that has been said in favour of other places, such as Rome, simply shows that they satisfy more or less the conditions of the problem, and are not improbable suggestions. None of them satisfy so well as Jerusalem the main condition, viz. the moral and spiritual situation required by the contents of the Epistle. That situation we have now more particularly to consider.

2. The position of those to whom our Epistle was written was one full of peril both from outward and from inward causes. They were in danger of apostatising from the faith because of persecution endured on account of it, and also because of doubts concerning its truth. The former part of this description of their state rests on express statements in the Epistle. That they had in time past been a persecuted people is manifest from chapter x. 32: "Call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions." That they were subject to tribulation on account of their faith still is plain from the fact that they are exhorted to remember their former experiences and their heroic bearing under them as an aid to patience now. The fact is also apparent from the eloquent recital of pious deeds done by the fathers in ancient days, in the eleventh chapter. The noble army of martyrs is made to march past as in a military review, to inspire the living sufferers with martial fortitude. Then, when the main body of the army has marched past, the attention of the spectators is directed to the Great Captain, for the same end. Tried Christians are bid look at Jesus, that His example may keep them from growing weary and faint in their minds.

The inner spiritual condition of the Hebrews is not so plainly and explicitly described, but ominous hints occur here

and there in the Epistle from which it can, with tolerable certainty, be inferred. They are in danger of slipping away from the Christian faith, as a boat is carried past the landing place by the strong current of a stream (chap. ii. 1). They have become dull in hearing, and in all their spiritual senses ; they are in their dotage or second childhood and need again to be fed with milk, *i.e.* to be taught anew the rudiments of the Christian faith, instead of with the strong meat which befits spiritual manhood (chap. v. 11-14). Their state is such as to suggest to a faithful instructor, anxious for their welfare, thoughts of a final apostasy and malignant renunciation of Christ, and to call up before his mind the unwelcome picture of a land well tilled and rained upon, yet bringing forth only thorns and briers, and so nigh unto cursing (chap. vi. 6-8). Evidently those of whom such things can be said are men who have never had insight into the genius and glory of the Christian religion, who as time went on have fallen more and more out of sympathy with the faith they profess, and who are now held on to it chiefly by the tie of custom which under the stress of outward trial may be snapped at any moment ; insomuch that their enlightened friend who writes to them feels it necessary to make a desperate effort to rescue them from the impending danger, by trying to show to them what is so clear to his own mind—the incomparable excellence and grandeur of the Christian religion.

That effort, in which the writer, stimulated by a supreme occasion, puts forth all his great intellectual and moral strength, is the best evidence that the foregoing account of the spiritual state of the Hebrew Church is not exaggerated. Such an effort was not made without urgent cause. The writers of the New Testament were not literary busy-bodies : they wrote under constraint of imperious needs. When Paul writes epistles to prove that salvation is through faith alone, it is because there is a powerful party at work

who are endeavouring to subvert the Gospel of grace by reintroducing a religion of legalism. In like manner when some unknown doctor in the Church sets himself to commend Christianity as the perfect religion, it is because he finds many fellow Christians clinging to Levitical shadows, unable to see that when the perfect has come the rudely imperfect should be allowed to pass away. No greater mistake could be committed than to assume that the readers of this Epistle were in the main in sympathy with the doctrinal views of the writer, and that the chief occasion for its being written was the need for consolation and strengthening under outward trial.¹ Such an assumption involves a virtual reflection on the judgment of the writer in expatiating at unnecessary length on accepted truths, and it must exercise a prejudicial influence on the exposition of the weightier, that is the doctrinal, part of the Epistle, taking the soul out of it for the expositor, and making the most striking thoughts appear in his eyes mere theological commonplaces. Thus the remarkable combination of the idea of *a forerunner* with that of a High Priest in chapter vi. 20, will probably provoke no remark, but be quietly passed by as if it were as familiar to the first readers as it has become to us; whereas it must have appeared quite startling in their eyes, and not unnaturally, as that one word $\pi\rho\delta\rho\mu\sigma$ expresses the whole essential difference between the Christian and the Levitical

¹ So Professor A. B. Davidson, in his scholarly commentary on this Epistle in *Handbooks for Bible Classes*. "The writer," he says, "evidently feels that, on the whole, he has his readers on his side" (p. 14). The description given of the inner condition of the Church is very faint and colourless, the only specific features mentioned being coldness, and an imperfect comprehension of the atonement. Any tendency to apostasy from the faith is conceived of as confined to a few individuals (p. 12). That the truths taught in this Epistle are theological commonplaces is expressly stated. "The Epistle is written from the secondary position of theological reflection upon the facts. The fact that the Son is a High Priest is a commonplace to his readers" (p. 106). The consequence of this view is that this work, while learned and accurate and helpful in details, is disappointing as a whole, and does not seem to lead up to any result.

religion—between the religion that brings men nigh to God, and the religion that kept or left men standing afar off.

Observing the points which are emphasized in the Epistle, we gather that three things connected with Christianity were stumbling-blocks to the Hebrew Christians :—

(1) The superseding of an ancient, divinely appointed religion by what appeared to be a novelty and an innovation. The Levitical worship was of venerable antiquity, and not of man's devising but of God's ordering; and how a system which had lasted so long and had derived its origin from heaven could ever pass away, and how it could be legitimately replaced by a religion which was of yesterday, were matters which ill-instructed Hebrew believers were at a loss to comprehend. Nor can we wonder greatly at this, when we consider with what desperate tenacity many at all times cling to old religious customs which can make no pretensions to Divine origin, but are merely human inventions.

(2) The Hebrew Christians found another stumbling-block in the humiliation and sufferings of Jesus regarded as the Christ. They were unable to reconcile the indignity of Christ's earthly experience with the dignity of His Person as the Son of God and promised Messiah. They did not see the glory of the Cross. They were unable to understand and appreciate the honour which was conferred upon Jesus in His being appointed to taste death as the Saviour and Sanctifier of sinners. They were unable to comprehend how it was consistent with the character of the First Cause and Last End of all things either to permit or to command His Son to pass through a curriculum of suffering and temptation as a qualification for office as the Captain of Salvation. In this respect they were like the apostles in the days of their discipleship, who, having confessed their faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, were utterly confounded when they heard their Master

immediately after go on to tell "how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things," and even be put to death. The pains taken and the ingenuity displayed by the writer in endeavouring to make it clear that suffering, or death, was for one reason or another a necessary experience of one occupying Christ's position, shows how much his readers stood in need of enlightenment on the subject.

(3) The third stumbling-block in Christianity to the mind of the Hebrews was the absence therefrom of a priesthood, and a sacrificial ritual. For that Christ was at once a Priest and a Sacrifice, they do not seem to have been able to comprehend, or even to imagine. Their ideas of priesthood and sacrifices were legal and technical. A priest was a man belonging to the tribe of Levi and to the family of Aaron, physically faultless, whose business it was to offer in behalf of the people the blood of bulls and goats as a sacrifice for sin. Of course Jesus could lay no claims to a priesthood of that sort. He was not of the tribe of Levi, or the house of Aaron, and He had nothing to offer—nothing, that is, which the legal mind could regard as a victim. And of any other priesthood than the legal, men accustomed to Levitical rites doubtless found it difficult to form any conception. A priest without priestly robes, and visible materials of sacrifice such as oxen, sheep, and goats, was to them a shadowy, unreal being. The author of the Epistle was well aware that such was the feeling of his readers; his whole manner of treating the subject betrays consciousness of the fact. Thus when he introduces a reference to the royal priesthood of Melchisedec to show them that a priesthood other than legal was recognised in Scripture and to help them to rise up to the thought of the spiritual, eternal, priesthood of Christ, he cannot refrain from giving expression to a feeling of irritation, as if conscious beforehand that he will not succeed in carrying their intelligence and sympathy along

with him. He feels it to be a hard, thankless task to set forth such lofty truths to dull, custom-ridden, mechanical minds.

Such being the situation of the parties addressed, it is easy to see what must be the character of a writing designed and fitted to conduct afflicted and doubting Christians through the perils of a transition time. It must be a composition combining argument and exhortation, now expounding or proving a great spiritual truth, now turning aside to utter a warning, or bringing to bear on heavy-hearted men practical considerations of a cheering, inspiring, comforting kind. Such accordingly is this Epistle. It is not a mere dry theological treatise, though it certainly begins in an abstract theological manner without preface or salutation. It is what it is called in the superscription in our English Testament, an epistle or letter, wherein the writer never loses sight of his readers and their perilous condition, but contrives to mingle argument and exhortation—the theoretical and the practical, so as to be at every point in contact with their hearts as well as their intellects. He does not give his theology first and thereafter its application; theology and counsel are interwoven throughout the web of the writing, so as to give to the whole the character of a “word of exhortation.”

3. The theoretical section of the Epistle, however, may be looked at apart, and the question asked, What does it teach? What conception of the Christian religion does it embody? That is the question to which we have now, at last, to turn our attention.

This section may be viewed either in relation to the occasion of its being written, or abstractly and *per se*. Viewed in this latter way it shows us the author's own mode of conceiving Christianity; viewed in the former it shows us the method which he pursued to bring others to his way of thinking. In the one aspect it is a dogmatic

treatise, in the other it is an apologetic treatise. The question we propose to consider thus resolves itself into two: What is the author's own idea of Christianity? and, What is his method of insinuating it into minds prepossessed with beliefs more or less incompatible therewith?

The author's own idea. He regards Christianity as the perfect, and therefore the final, religion. It is perfect because it accomplishes the end of religion, and because it does this it can never be superseded. Nothing better can take its place. But what is the end of religion? To bring men nigh to God, to establish between man and God a fellowship as complete and intimate as if sin had never existed. This accordingly is what the writer of our Epistle emphasizes. Christianity for him is the religion of free, unrestricted access to God; the religion of a new, everlasting covenant under which sin is completely extinguished and can act no longer as a separating influence. This thought runs like a refrain through the Epistle. It appears first distinctly in the place where Christ the High Priest of the New Testament is called a *forerunner* (vi. 20). Where the High Priest of the new era can go, we may follow, in contrast to the state of things under the old covenant, according to which the High Priest of Israel could alone go into the Most Holy Place. The thought recurs at vii. 19, where the Christian religion is in effect characterized as the religion of the better hope, because the religion through which we draw nigh to God. The same great idea lurks in the puzzle concerning the altar of incense whose position in the tabernacle it is impossible to define (ix. 4). It belonged to the place within the veil in spirit and function, but it had to be without for daily use, in connexion with the service carried on in the first compartment. The source of this anomaly was the veil, whose very existence was the emblem of a rude, imperfect religion, under which men could not get nigh to God.

Finally, how prominent a place the idea held in the writer's mind, appears from the fact that when he has finished his theoretic statement he commences his last exhortation to his readers in these terms: "Having therefore, brethren, liberty to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God; *let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith*" (x. 19-22).

This positive idea of the Christian religion contains an implicit contrast between it and the Levitical religion. The writer thinks of the latter as a religion which failed to accomplish the end of religion, and kept men or left them far off from God. Many things about it were to his view significant of this radical and fatal defect, but chiefly the veil dividing the tabernacle into two compartments,—an outer chamber accessible to the priests for the performance of their daily service, and an inner chamber accessible only to the high priest, and even to him only once a year and after the most careful precautions. That veil prohibitory and minatory was the emblem of a religion which taught a negative idea of Divine holiness, presenting God as saying: Stand off, I am unapproachably holy; and left the conscience of the worshipper unpurged, so that he was afraid to come near. As such the veil was a prophecy of transiency in reference to the system with which it was connected. For no religion may or can endure which fails in the great end for which religion exists. Accordingly in the Epistle the temporary character of the Levitical religion is proclaimed with emphasis and iteration. On the other hand, permanency is predicated of the Christian religion with if possible greater emphasis and iteration. The burden of the Epistle is: The Levitical religion for a time, Christianity for aye. Of everything connected with

Christianity eternity is predicated. The salvation it provides is *eternal*, its priesthood is *for ever*, the great High Priest possesses the power of an *endless life*, and by the offering of Himself through the *eternal* Spirit obtained *eternal* redemption for us. Those who believe in Him have the promise of an *eternal* inheritance. The new covenant is *everlasting*.

The contrast between the Levitical religion and Christianity in the essential vital point—the establishment of real unrestricted fellowship between man and God—naturally suggests the method of contrast generally as a good one for the apologetic purpose in hand. The central defect may be presumed to imply defect at all points, and on inquiry the fact will probably turn out to be so. Accordingly the writer adopts this method, and institutes a series of comparisons so managed as, while duly and even generously recognising whatever was good in the old system, to mark it indelibly with a stamp of inferiority. The first point of comparison that would naturally occur to the mind would be that of the priesthood. The Levitical religion had its high priest, with his gorgeous robes a very imposing figure. How about Christianity; can its superiority be demonstrated here? If not the case breaks down, for the whole value of a religion lies in its provisions for dealing with the problem of sin. The question of questions is, Can it perfect the worshipper as to conscience? Only where there is a perfect priest can there be a perfect religion. The writer will need all his skill to establish his case here. Not that there is any room for doubt to men possessing spiritual insight, but because he is writing to men who lack that gift, and to whom it is difficult to make it clear that Christ was a Priest at all, not to speak of His being the perfect Priest, the very ideal of Priesthood realized.

A contrast between Christ and Moses might readily

suggest itself. To institute this contrast might indeed seem to be raising questions not vital to the argument. But there was room for relevant comparison here also. For Moses was the leader of Israel during the memorable epoch of her redemption out of Egypt, and Jesus was the Captain of a still greater salvation. The general resemblance in the point of leadership might make plain some things incidental to the career of a captain. And if it could be shown that Jesus was greater than Moses it would prevent the prestige of the lesser leader from shutting the mind to the claims of the greater.

Another contrast still was possible,—one that would not readily occur to us, but which lay ready to the hand of one writing to Hebrews familiar with the current views of Jewish theology. In that theology angels figured prominently, and in particular they were believed to have been God's agents in the revelation of the law to Moses and Israel. This view gave to that revelation a very august and imposing character, through which the Christian revelation might suffer eclipse. A comparison between Christ and angels was therefore forced on a writer who desired to deal exhaustively with the sources of anti-Christian prejudices. He must show that Christ was higher in dignity than angels, that the word spoken through Him might receive due attention.

These contrasts are all instituted in the Epistle, but in the reverse order. The most remote from the centre, and as we are apt to think the least important, comes first; and the most vital, last. First the agents of revelation under the two Testaments are compared; then their respective Captains of salvation, and then finally their High Priests. It is shown first, that Christ is greater than angels as One who speaks to men in God's name; second, that He is greater than Moses as the leader of a redeemed host; third, that He is greater than Aaron as one who transacts

for men in God's presence. The argument will unfold itself gradually and need not here be outlined.

The opening sentences of the Epistle may be said to contain yet another comparison—between Christ and the *Prophets*, the human agents of the earlier revelation. This comparison is less developed and less emphasized, partly because the prophets were in the same line with Jesus, precursors rather than rivals, preaching the gospel of a Messiah and a Divine kingdom before the epoch of fulfilment, pointing on to that epoch and making no pretence to finality; partly because they were men, not angels, less likely to become the objects of an overweening idolatrous esteem. But there is a latent contrast here also, as we shall see. The revelation of the Son was the natural and needed complement of prophetic revelation.

Taken as a whole, the Epistle, in its apologetic aspect, is a masterpiece, meeting effectually a most urgent need of the early apostolic age, and in its general principles, if not in all its arguments, of perennial value to the Christian Church. At transition times, when an old world is passing away and a new world is taking its place, it is ever the fewest who enter with full intelligence and sympathy into the spirit of the new time. The majority, from timidity, reverence, or lower motives, go along with the new movement only with half their heart, and have an all but invincible hankering after old custom, and a strong reluctance to break with the past. Christ signalled and also kindly apologized for this conservative tendency when He said, "No man having drunk old wine desireth new, for he saith, the old is good." For such half-hearted ones, rise in a transition time, a prophet is needed to interpret the new, and a literature of an apologetic character, vindicating the rights of the new while knowing how to recognise the worth of the past. Such a prophet was the writer of this Epistle, and such a literature is preserved for us therein.

It is the only piece of writing in the New Testament of a formally and systematically apologetic nature. Elsewhere are to be found ideas helpful to Christians passing through a transition time, notably in the Pauline Epistles. But the stray apologetic ideas occurring in these Epistles, though valuable, were not sufficient. A more detailed and elaborate theology of mediation was wanted to accomplish the work of making Jewish believers Christians who did not look back. Paul did not go sufficiently into particulars; he spoke of the law too much as a whole; a proceeding quite natural in one who had passed through his experience. He had tried to make the law everything, and having failed, he swung to the opposite extreme and pronounced it nothing. That salvation could not come through legalism needed no proof for him, it was axiomatically clear. It was enough to say oracularly, “By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.”

That might be enough for Paul, but it was not enough for ordinary men who lacked his intense experience, clear insight, and the thoroughness which can follow to their last consequences accepted principles. A more detailed, shall I say more patient, less impassioned apologetic was wanted to carry the mass of Jewish believers safely through the perils of a transitional period. It was not enough to say: Christ is come, therefore the legal economy must take end; it was needful to point out carefully what men had got in Christ—not merely a Saviour in a general way, but the reality of all Old Testament symbols, the substance of which legal rites were shadows; to demonstrate, in short, that not grace alone but *truth* had come by Christ, truth in the sense of spiritual reality. Paul insisted mainly on the *grace* that came by Christ. It was reserved for the author of our Epistle to insist on the *truth*. Paul had not indeed altogether overlooked this aspect. His Epistles contain hints of the doctrine that the Levitical rites were

shadows of good things to come, as in the significant passage, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." But the hints remain undeveloped. Of what splendid developments they were capable, appears in our Epistle, where the Melchisedec Priesthood of Christ is unfolded with such subtlety of argument and elevation of thought as awaken the admiration of all.

If the view prevalent in the Eastern section of the early Church, that Paul was the author of our Epistle, were true, then we should have to say that in it he performed a service which he had not had leisure or occasion to render in any other epistle. But the Pauline authorship seems destitute of all probability. *A priori* it is unlikely that the man who wrote the recognised Pauline Epistles should be the man to achieve the task prescribed to the writer of this Epistle to the Hebrews. It is seldom given to one man to do for his age all that it needs. Paul surely did enough without claiming for him everything. Moreover the style, the temperament, and the cast of thought characteristic of this Epistle are markedly different from those traceable in the letters to the Galatian, Corinthian and Roman Churches. The difference in style has been often commented on, but the contrast in the other respects is even more arresting. The contrast has its source in diversity of mental constitution and of religious experience. Paul was of an impetuous, passionate, vehement nature; hence his thought rushes on like a mountain torrent leaping over the rocks. The writer of our Epistle is obviously a man of calm, contemplative, patient spirit, and hence the movement of his mind is like that of a stately river flowing through a plain. Their respective ways of looking at the law speaks to an entirely different religious history. The law had been to Paul a source of the knowledge of sin, an irritant to sin, and a murderer of hope; therefore he ascribed to it the same functions in the moral education

of mankind. The writer of our Epistle, on the other hand, appears to have gained his insight into the transient character of the Levitical religion and the glory of Christianity, not through a fruitless attempt at keeping the law with Pharisaic scrupulosity, but through a mental discipline enabling him to distinguish between symbol and spiritual reality, shadow and substance. In other words, while Paul was a moralist, he was a religious philosopher; while for Paul the organ of spiritual knowledge was the conscience, for him it was devout reason.

One reason which induced the ancients to regard Paul as the writer, and which is still not without its influence on opinion, was the wish to have for so important an Epistle a worthy, and in view of the question of canonicity, an apostolic author. And it is certainly very remarkable that the authorship of so valuable a writing should be unknown. And yet on the other hand it seems fitting that the author of an Epistle which begins by virtually proclaiming God as the only speaker in Scripture, and Jesus Christ as the one speaker in the New Testament, should himself retire out of sight into the background. Was it not meet that he who tells us at the outset that God's last great word to men was spoken by His Son, should disappear like a star in the presence of the great luminary of day? Was it not seemly that he who wrote this book in praise of Christ the Great High Priest, should be but a voice saying to all after-time, "This is God's beloved Son, hear ye Him," and that when the voice was spoken he should disappear with Moses, Aaron, and all the worthies of the old covenant, and allow Christ Himself to speak without any medium between Him and us? "When the voice was past, Jesus was found alone." So it was on the hill of transfiguration, so let it be with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Let us be content to remain in ignorance of its author, and seek the knowledge of his mind.

The canonicity of the Epistle is entirely independent of the question of authorship. It depends on canonical *function*. That the Epistle performs an important function in the organism of New Testament literature is self-evident, if the views presented in the foregoing pages as to its character and aim be correct.

A. B. BRUCE.

JEWISH CONTROVERSY AND THE "PUGIO FIDEI."

(Conclusion.)

WE now come to the accusation against the *Pugio*, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy divides methodically into three classes.

I. *Six proofs of forgeries pure and simple.*

1. The Midrash of R. Moses quoted in the *Pugio* (p. 354) is here composed of two different Midrashic pieces. In the first, as Dr. Schiller-Szinessy rightly points out, there is an even better reading in the *Pugio* than in our editions. The editions have Jeremiah xxx. 21, whilst the *Pugio* gives 22 as well; hence it is pronounced a forgery. Why so? Do we not find that scribes abridge quotations and others write them in full? The following passage in the *Pugio*, is fathered, according to Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, on R. Huna, who said it in the name of R. Iddi; but if it is so, Herr Epstein rightly observes that the author of the *Pugio* must have been an eminent Talmudic scholar, as he knew of these two names, which are seldom found together. Indeed, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy has misunderstood altogether the words of R. Huna; for the latter does not apply *geber* (Jer. xxxi. 22) to the Messiah, but *hudashim* as in the following passage of Psalm ii. 7: *This day I have begotten thee*, found in the Midrash Tillim. There the creation of the Messiah is called

a new creation, as is the case in R. Moses had-Darshan's passage. Thus the following, from Judges v. 8, "Elegit Deus nova" (A.V., *They chose new gods*), refers also to the Messiah. Moses put together two Midrashic passages for his purpose, like other later Midrashic authors,¹ and Martini also had a right to do the same, without being on that account a forger. Moses does not apply the passage of Jeremiah to the Virgin, but Martini does, and makes no mystery of it that it is his own interpretation.² The sneer of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy at Martini, because he did not know how to translate the words **אָז לְחַם שָׂעִירִים** (Jud. v. 8), is somewhat out of place, since all commentators and exegetes are in the same case.

2. P. 397. The passage about the ten kings. In the Targum and *Pirqe* of R. Eliezer the ninth king is the Messiah and the tenth is God; in the Midrash of the *Pugio*, quoted in the name of R. Moses had-Darshan, the ninth king is Vespasian, and the tenth is the Messiah, identified with God Himself. "But," says Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, "such cannot be true when fathered on old Jewish tradition." Still, as Herr Epstein points out, the Midrash of the ten kings, edited from a Parma MS.,³ mentions Vespasian, and thus the Messiah must be the tenth king. Why should R. Moses not have had a similar text as the MS. of Parma? We mention, by the way, that Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's argument to the effect that from 1 Corinthians xv. 28 we may conclude that the

¹ Dr. N. Brüll's *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur*, viii. (1887), p. 124 *seqq.*

² This passage is already mentioned in *Controversies of the Twelfth Century* (see p. 94).

³ *Bibliotheca Haggadica*, ed. by Chajim M. Horowitz. Frankfurt am Main, 1881; i. pp. 38-55. The word **הַתְּשִׁיעֵי** (p. 55) ought to be **הַעֲשֵׂרֵי**: since Alexander is the eighth king, Vespasian the ninth, the last, the Messiah, must be the tenth king. Curiously enough, this Midrash ends with the following words: **וְלֹכִי אֶלְפִים שָׁנָה יַתְּכִבְצֵוּ לְדִין שְׁנָאכֵר יְהִינּוּ מִזּוּמִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁלִישִׁי יְקִמְנּוּ** (comp. *Pugio*, p. 877).

Midrash on the ten kings was already known in the middle of the first century A.D., is rather arbitrary.

3. P. 421. Martini translates תָלִמְדוֹד לֹמֵר by *docet docendum*, rightly, although not elegantly, and he does not give it as an interrogation. To say that the passage is a shameful concoction is rather hasty, since we do not possess the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan, to whom Dr. Schiller-Szinessy attributes an enlightened mind, without having the opportunity of reading his writings. We confess that it is indeed strange that *Yhvh* should be the name of the Messiah; but Moses of Narbonne is, to judge from the fragments of his Midrash, sometimes astonishingly strange. Still he is certainly not more strange than the *Zohar*, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy considers genuine. In late *Midrashim* it is indeed mentioned that the Messiah is called *Yhvh*.¹

4. P. 759. Concerning the Redeemer having no father, with reference to the Midrash on Lamentations v. 2, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says the chief force of the passage consists in the omission of the בַּתִּים, "and mother," and that *goel*, redeemer, is applied to the Messiah. Well, Abrabanel had also the reading of this Midrash without בַּתִּים, and *goel* is applied in the earliest Midrash to the Messiah.

5. P. 866. By Siphre Martini means *Thorath Kohanim* or the *Siphro*² (comp. p. 732). Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says of this passage, "Up to a certain point it certainly is to be found in *Siphro*." He admits also that there are variations in the quotation of it by various authors. Why then should Martini not have had an annotated copy, containing the variations he gives? Does Dr. Schiller-Szinessy forget that there was a *Siphro of another kind*?³ Why could Martini not have had this before him? Surely Martini

¹ See. A. Epstein in the *Beth Talmud*, V. pp. 160 and 212.

² Or *Siphra*.

³ ספרא של פנים אחרים.

wrote for the Jews, and he knew well that they would detect his forgery if it were not found in their books. Besides, the substance of this passage is to be found in other books, from which Martini could have taken it without forging. *Pugio*, p. 535; *Pesiqtha Rabbathi*, 37; comp. also *Zohar*, § יי'קְהָל. Besides, according to Herr Epstein, Lorca has the same passage from the *Siphra*. Don Vidal Ferrer in his reply does not contest the authenticity of it, as he does in many other instances.¹

6. P. 877. Here Martini quotes a Midrash with an additional passage, saying, *Hucusque glossa*. On this Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says: "The *Hucusque glossa* is doubly untrue, for in lieu of the genuine piece a substitution is made." That is illogical. If Martini had intended to forge, he would not have said it was a gloss; it is because he found in his copy a gloss that he says so. How many glosses have entered into our present editions and MSS. of the Midrashim?

II. *Six proofs of the ignorance of the translators pure and simple.*

Of 1, I have disposed elsewhere.² 2 and 4 are excused by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy himself, since Jewish scholars have made the same blunder. 3. Martini translates בְשׂוֹרִי (Hos. ix. 12) by *incarnatio mea*, whilst every child, says Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, acquainted with Hebrew knows that it means "When I depart from them." Martini had certainly the Vulgate at his disposal, where he found and gave the right translation *in recessu meo* (p. 697). But for his purpose he took the word as בְשָׁרִי, "my flesh" (so it is rendered by LXX. and Theodotion), to which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy would not have objected if he had found it in a Midrash with the introductory words, אל תַּקְרִי, "do not read so, but so."³

¹ See p. 193.

² *The Academy*, September 17, 1887.

³ It was taken, for controversial purpose, in the same meaning in the eleventh

4 b. P. 859. Martini translates his passage as he found it in his MS. That two words were transposed in it did not concern him, for notwithstanding the nonsense thereby produced, like an orthodox Jew, he does not admit any scribes' blunders in holy books.

5. P. 861 is a mistake; but perhaps Martini had לברן in his text. Besides, there were no Buxtorf's, no Levy's Dictionary as yet. The same is the case with 6, where Martini found פה, and translated accordingly. We admit that he was not critical; but for all that he was neither an ignoramus nor a forger. How many *responsa* have been written by rabbis on difficult passages which could have been settled if they had had the right reading?

III. *Six proofs of forgeries and ignorance combined.*

1. P. 277. Martini mentions the reading **כָּאַרְוֹ** (Ps. xxii. 17), for **כָּאַרְיִ**, as a Massoretic gloss, rubricated under the § of **תקון סופרים**, and reported from the Midrash of R. Moses had-Darshan. Now it is true that in the Massoretic rubric in our editions **כָּאַרְוֹ** is not to be found. But where is the proof that Moses had-Darshan did not give it? We know that he reported variations in the Pentateuch¹ of which we otherwise know nothing; why then should he not have variations in this Massoretic §? At all events there is a Massoretic gloss on **כָּאַרְיִ** which is not quite clear, and early translators read accordingly. What Dr.

century, or even before. Judah Hadassi (see p. 95) says, in the expurgated § 102, the following: טענו וברו מלבים הילוהים חכמיך ותעו והבטו לעמך ו והפכו דברי אלהים חיים מותרך ומסרו להם נאם יוי לאדרני לאדרני כי גם אווי להם בשרו ממה לחוק כי אלהים לבש בשרogue, No. 2371).

¹ See Herr A. Epstein's article in the *Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wiss. der Judenthums*, 1885, p. 295. Lorea (see p. 192) has also תקון סופרים **כָּאַרְוֹ** according to Herr Epstein's information. It is clear from Azariah de Rossi (**מַאֲזָרְ עִנִּים**, chap. 15) that the תקון סופרים varied in different authors. See also A. Geiger, *Urschrift* (Breslau, 1858), p. 309 *seqq.* Martini quotes from Ben Ascher's **דָקְרוֹן**, which varies in the MSS. (see the edition by Baer and Strack, Leipzig, 1879).

Schiller-Szinessy means by reproaching Martini for translating **כָּאַרְנוֹ** by *foderunt*, which means “digging,” as well as piercing, we cannot understand. On this particular point Solomon ben Adret refutes a controversialist who adduces a proof from the Massoretic rule. The controversialist is no other than Martini, which is in direct contradiction with Dr. Schiller-Szinessy’s statement that Solomon, out of orthodoxy, would not keep a heretical work like the *Pugio* in his house. We may draw the attention of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy to the passages quoted by Dr. Graetz,¹ which will, we believe, convince him that Solomon ben Adret knew something of Martini. Why should Solomon be more orthodox than the Mishnah, in which it is expressly prescribed that the Jew should know what to answer to the *Epicuros* (or heretic), and therefore should be obliged to read heretical books. If Solomon did not know Latin, he could find some one who did. As to a connexion of Martini with Fray Pablo, on which account Solomon would have objected to have the *Pugio* in his house, we have proved that there could have been none so far as regards the composition of the *Pugio*.²

2. P. 563. Here Dr. Schiller-Szinessy exclaims: “Here is a passage which testifies no less to the incapacity than to the audacity of the forger. Can anybody who is in the least acquainted with rabbinical literature believe that any rabbi would teach so monstrous a piece of nonsense, ay, of idolatry, as is here attributed to R. Mosheh Hadarshan, that the Lord should have commanded the angels to worship the first man?” We quite agree with Dr. Schiller-Szinessy about the nonsense; but what can we do? We find the same in the Prague MS., with only slight variations.³

¹ *Op. cit.*, vii. p. 164 seq., and Dr. Perles in his monograph *R. Salomo b. Abraham b. Adereth, etc.*, Breslau, 1863, p. 75, and the Hebrew part.

² See p. 103.

³ אֲדֵם הָרִאשׁוֹן יוֹם שָׂנְתַקְבָּצָה דָּעַתוֹ אֶלְיוֹ אָמַר הַבָּה לְמַלְאָכִי הַשְׁרָת בְּוֹאָוֹ

3. P. 657. The Messiah is called "peace," as mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations, according to Martini. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is again right in saying that it is not to be found in our editions and even in MSS.; but it is found in one of the small treatises printed with the Talmud called *Perek hash-Shalom*. We cannot discuss here the age of this treatise, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy supposes to have been composed at the end of the thirteenth century, and consequently to be contemporary with Martini, and to have been written perhaps by a convert! This must be left for another occasion, since it does not interfere one way or another with our argument.¹ Dr. Schiller-Szinessy says: "But one might ask, Why did the author of the *Pugio Fidei* quote a passage from a book where it is not to be found, when he could have quoted it from a book where it is to be found? To this we give the following answer. In the first place, because of the high antiquity and authority of the *Ekha rabbathi*, between the composition of which and that of *Perek Hasshalom*, many centuries elapsed." This, of course, will have first to be proved. But what is astonishing is, that while Dr. Schiller-Szinessy charges the author of the *Pugio* with ignorance, he yet gives him credit for knowing that the Midrash on Lamentations is of such a high antiquity, a knowledge which has only been acquired by modern criticism. In Martini's time the Jews saw no difference of age between one Midrash and another. It would be much more reasonable to say that Martini found the passage in question in the Midrash on Lamentations,

... והשתהוו לו באו מלacci השרת לרצונו של הב"ה היטן . . . The introductory words in Martini, "Says Joshua ben Nun," are usually employed by Eldad the Danite, whose legends came to Kairowan, and from hence to Narbonne.

We may merely mention, on the authority of Herr A. Epstein, that Nahmani quotes the passage in question from an old sourcee. He says in his אבנור ר' יוסי הנגלי אמר אפ' ש' קצין (MS.), chap. 2, the following: מישיח נקרא שלום שנאמר אבי עד יש' שלום ix. 5 has already "the Messiah of peace."

where a copyist might have introduced it, as is often the case. Or the *Perek hash-Shalom* might have been irregularly bound together with the Midrash on Lamentations, as is also the case sometimes in MSS.

6. P. 852. The word רָאשׁ is omitted, but given in the margin, probably from a MS. Why is it then a shameless forgery? As to ignorance in this passage, Martini errs with Jewish scholars, and to his application to the crucifixion he has as much right as any other writer who might explain it with a view to his particular purpose. I should say that the *Zohar*, which is authentic in the eyes of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is no better than Martini.

IV. *Proof of the irreverence of the forger.*

P. 419. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy objects to Moses had-Darshan introducing the Messiah as “loving the daughters of Israel”; so do we; but what can be done? it is the same in the Prague MS. Must this MS. become a forgery too?¹

We now come to the last point, that about the name of R. Rahmon, whose glosses are given in the *Pugio*. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy is not the first to be puzzled by this strange name. The late Dr. Zunz, who according to Dr. Schiller-Szinessy did not read the *Pugio*, has a more complete list of the Rahmon quotations than himself. Dr. Zunz suggested, and we believe rightly, that the word Rahmon is a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic רְחוּמִיאֵ, the name of an author who was in vogue with the Kabbalists of Catalonia in the thirteenth century. Azriel, the master of Nahmani, is the author of the *Bahir*,² and he often quotes רְחוּמִיאֵ; so does the *Zohar*, the author of which was a contemporary of Martini. In the margins of the MSS. which the Jews had to give up to Martini, the glosses of a Rahmon might

ובתוכך אפריוון מישיח בן דוד שהוא אהוב בנות ישראל שנאמר הווכו רצוף . . . אהבה מבנות ירושלים . . . The Prague MS. has the passage on Gen. ii. 1, and the *Pugio* on Gen. ii. 9. Is this an argument for forgery, or for the use of two different texts.

² See *Israelitische Letterbode* (Amsterdam), vol. iii. p. 20, and above, p. 97.

thus have been found. These glosses are really of so little importance for Martini's purposes, that he would not have cared to invent them if they had not been there.¹ And had Martini intended to forge, surely he would have named a better known author, or not have given them at all as glosses. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy concludes dramatically: "This enigmatic Rachmon is no rabbi, but is none less than Rahmon, *i.e.* Ramon or Raymund, in full; Raymundus Martin himself, the supposed author of the *Pugio Fidei* in its totality! What would Zunz and Pusey, if they were here, say to this extraordinary *dénouement!*" We suppose that they would be as much amused by the joke as we are. On the one hand Ramon would be transcribed רַמְוִן, as in Nahmani's contemporary disputation, a word by the way which is genuinely Hebrew. If רַחֲמָן is purposely given as רַחֲמֵן, the latter name must have been of some notoriety, and if so, Dr. Zunz was right in comparing it with רַחֲמֵא² On the other hand, if the rogue and buffoon Pablo had been the author of the *Pugio*, we could understand how for the sake of a joke or of flattery, Martini might appear as Rahmon; but Pablo is now out of the question, and it is Martini who must

¹ It is true that the quotations from Rahmon on pp. 854 and 928 of the *Pugio* are strikingly adapted for Christian purposes. But is it not the same with the passage on p. 538, quoted by Dr. Driver in THE EXPOSITOR, 1887, p. 267, note 1, which Dr. Schiller-Szinessy does not contest, probably because the substance of it is also to be found in the Midrash on Samuel, chap. 16? And how about the passage on p. 851, where the following words of the printed *Midrash rabbah* are quoted: "And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering and laid it upon Isaac his son" (Gen. xxii. 6), "like him who carried his cross on his shoulder"? Has Martini not a right to apply it to Jesus, although the Midrash does not mean it? If, by chance, the *Midrash rabbah* had been lost like that of R. Moses, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy would no doubt have proclaimed this passage as a forgery! Why, Dr. Schiller-Szinessy himself applies the passage in Isaiah liii. 8, "And with the rich in His death," to Joseph of Arimathea, of which no Jewish commentator ever dreamt, and which is even rejected by most of the Christian interpreters!

² See also *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, von A. Epstein, Wien, 1887; i. p. 110, note 2.

have invented the form Rahmon, *i.e.* his own name. This is another *dénouement*.

No doubt Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's article on the *Pugio* would have done great service to the critical study of the book, had he not employed such animated language against Pablo Christiani,—who certainly was a fanatic, but nevertheless not a rogue and a buffoon,—as well as against Martini, whom he accuses of ignorance. It would be going too far to say with Dr. Graetz that Martini understood Hebrew better than St. Jerome; but he must have known the language, having been one of the eight Dominican brothers who went to study Arabic, Hebrew, and Chaldee in the new school of Oriental languages instituted by Raymundus de Peñaforde. Peter Marsilio (who wrote at the end of the thirteenth century) said of him:¹ “Erat frater iste dignus memoria fr. Raymundus Martini persona multum dotata, clericus multum sufficiens in Latino, philosophus in arabico, magnus rabinus et magister in hebraico, et in lingua chaldaica multum doctus, qui de Sobiratis oriundus nedium regi, verum S. Ludovico regi francorum et illi bono regi Tunicensi carissimus et familiarissimus habebatur [qui talentum sue scientie non abscondens duo opera fecit ad convincendam perfidiam Judeorom, in quibus excellenter relucet sua sapientia. Fecit et diversa opera contra sectum Saracenorū, eloquentia plena et veritate fundata, ut merito corpore mortuus, deo vivus ejus memoria non deficiat . . .].”² Most probably converted Jews were the teachers of Hebrew and Chaldee, and Pablo may have been one of them long before 1263. Martini made perhaps a dozen errors in the course of some hundred quotations, and on this account is charged with ignorance. If that however is to be the rule of judgment, very few scholars will be left for Oriental

¹ See *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*. Von P. Heinrich Denifle, p. 496, note 1104.

² The words in ‘ ’ were communicated to us by Pater Denifle.

philology at all. Unfortunately the Midrash of Moses had-Darshan is at present lost, and we cannot compare all Martini's quotations, but we have seen that where we have the means of confronting him with the remains of this Midrash he stands blameless. It is curious that most of his forgeries are reported to have been in this Midrash. Why did he forge on this and not elsewhere? Did he by chance know that this Midrash would be inaccessible to the Jews of the future in consequence of its loss? We have already mentioned the absurdity of forging his name under the disguise of Rahmon. As a matter of fact, Martini was neither ignorant nor critical, but he knew Hebrew and Rabbinical literature, and made a curious selection of the latter, for which alone he deserves the name of a learned man. The collection was made by him and not by Pablo who died four years before it was made. In order to judge Martini impartially, MSS. of the *Pugio* ought first to be examined;¹ only so shall we ascertain whether he is correctly given in print, and possibly by this process the dozen not very grave errors alleged against him would melt into nothing. Perhaps the article promised by Father Denifle on the newly discovered book of Martini will throw some light on the *Pugio* also.² Anyhow, the late Drs. Pusey and Zunz do not merit the reproaches of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy for not having read the *Pugio*, for as he himself will confess, he has judged the *Pugio* without having taken notice of what his predecessors have said. And why did a scholar, who blames his pupils for not following the Mishnah, transgress the Talmudic saying, "Do not reply to a lion after his death"?

¹ Through the courtesy of Pater Denifle, we are informed that there are MSS. of the *Pugio* in the libraries of Sevilla, the Escorial, Barcelona, and Toulouse. There is also one in Paris.

² Pater Denifle has had the goodness to inform me that this work of Martini is directed more against the Saracenes (Arabs) than against the Jews. Martini shows in it a remarkable acquaintance with Arabic writings. This work, as well as the *Capistrum*, were composed before the *Pugio*.

Soon after Martini (about 1336), another apostate with the name of Abner¹ or Alfonso of Valladolid, originated a disputation in that town, in which he naturally remained victorious. Abner composed a treatise against the Agadah with the title of *Teacher of Justice*,² which is only known by quotations, and two other works in Spanish with the title of *La Concordia de las Leyes*, and *Libro de las Gracias*. He also composed a refutation of Jacob ben Reuben's *Wars of God*,³ which he translated into Spanish by the wish of the Infanta Blanca. In it is mentioned a "History of Jesus,"⁴ composed in the Jerusalem dialect (Aramaic). This is possibly identical with a fragment of a MS. found in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg. He also composed treatises in favour of astrology and fatalism, which, he says, were the occasion of his conversion, as well as some letters against the Jews.

Nicolaus de Lyra, author of the *Postils*, composed also a controversial treatise in 1309 with the title of "De Messia, ejusque adventu, una cum responsione ad Judæorum argumenta quatuordecim contra veritatem Evangeliorum." Nicolaus is treated by the Spaniard Hayyim ben Musa, of whom we shall speak later on, as a Jew by birth, but it appears without doubt, from various passages of his book, that he was born a Christian, more especially as he says that he knew only a little Hebrew.

The sources of the accusations brought against the Jews, and of the defence they made, are now exhausted. Every possible Biblical passage was collected by Joseph Kimhi, Jacob ben Reuben, and Meir of Narbonne; Nicolaus of Paris and Paulus of Montpellier brought forward all the blasphemies which, according to them, are contained in the Talmud and the Prayer-Book; and Raymundus Martini called to his assistance the Midrashim, old and new, as

¹ He is called jokingly נָבָחַיְצָךְ "father of darkness."

² מורה צדק

³ See p. 91.

⁴ See p. 81, note 2.

well as the Targum and the commentators. The following disputations, official or unofficial, contain no new matter; there is only a change in the names of the adversaries, of the localities and of the titles of their productions. Some of the defences are more philosophical than others: that is all the difference between them. We shall therefore speak of them briefly, as they have been already mentioned above. The convert John of Valladolid, author of a work with the title of *Concordia legum*, held a disputation at Burgos, and later at Avila in 1375, where the Jewish opponent is called Moses Kohen of Tordesillas. His answers are incorporated in a work entitled "The Help of Faith."¹ He has at the end a chapter against Alfonso (Abner).

About 1380 Shem-Tob ben Shaprut composed at Tarragona an enlarged edition of Jacob ben Reuben's controversial work, with additional passages on the Agadah, and answers to Alfonso de Valladolid's book, as well as to Pedro di Luna, afterwards Pope Benedict XIII. It is divided into fifteen parts, and bears the title *The Tried Stone*.² The controversy is carried on between the Trinitarian and the Unitarian.³ Neither Moses nor Shem-Tob mention Martini, and they do not refer to the Midrashic passages in the *Pugio*.

The grammarian and mathematician, Profeit Duran (Isaac Levi), of Perpignan, who was forced to become a convert and to remain a Christian for a short time, wrote after 1391 a controversial treatise under the title of *Shame of the Nations*,⁴ and a satire in verse against some converts, which was commented on by Joseph Shem-Tob. About the same time the philosopher Hasdai Crescas of Saragossa wrote a controversial book in Spanish, of which only the Hebrew translation exists, by Joseph ben Shem Tob.⁵

¹ הַכִּימֵר עָזֶר האַמְנוֹנָה (in MS.). The controversy is carried on between the convert, and the speaker.

² אָבִן בְּחָנָן (in MS.).

³ המיחד והמשליך.

⁴ כלימת הגויים.

⁵ See p. 194.

After the horrible massacre of 1399 in Prague, Lipman (Yom Tob) of Mühlhausen, rabbi at Prague, composed his controversial treatise¹ against the apostate Pesah, whose Christian name was Peter. Lipman was remarkable for his time as a German Jew, who had read the New Testament in Latin.

We shall only mention the name of the ambitious Rabbi Solomon of Burgos, called as a Christian, Paulus de Santa Maria (about 1400), who wrote additions to the *postils* of Nicolaus of Lyra, in order to oppose even the study of the rabbinical commentary of Rashi, recommended by Nicolaus.

In 1412, after the terrible massacre of the Jews in Spain, which produced wholesale conversions, the Pope Benedict XIII. (Pedro di Luna) ordered a disputation to be held at Tortosa, which was chiefly conducted by the convert Joshua Lorki (Lorca), called as a Christian Geronimo de Santa Fé. He mostly made use of Martini's *Pugio Fidei*, in order to prove from Jewish writings the Christian dogmas, and repeated the accusations brought against the Talmud as being a blasphemous book. Amongst the Jewish rabbis who had to attend the meetings, which lasted over a year (February, 1413, to November, 1414), was the famous Joseph Albo, author of the philosophico-theological book, called *Iqqarim* (or "roots"). The defence was the same as on previous occasions, viz. most of the rabbis rejected the authority of the Agadah. Victory remained with force, and bulls and restrictive laws were revived not only against the Jews, but even against the Marranos, or converted Jews, who were suspected, and not without cause, of clinging in their hearts to the old faith. An increase of polemical literature was one of the results of this disputation also; Geronimo composed two works under the title of (1) *Tractatus contra perfidiam Judae-*

¹ ב' הנזחן, to be distinguished from an older treatise with the same title. Both are to be found in Wagenseil's *Tela ignea Satanae*.

orum et contra Talmud; and (2) *Hebraemastix*, which contains the agadic passages in favour of Christianity. This exists also in Hebrew (probably written by Geronimo himself in Hebrew), as we are informed by our friend Herr A. Epstein, who possesses a MS. of it, probably unique. Its chief importance is for the criticism of the *Pugio Fidei*, of which Geronimo made free use, and more especially for the additional passages which are to be found there from the Midrash of R. Moses of Narbonne. It is however doubtful whether Geronimo had a copy of this Midrash. The Hebrew title of it is *Sepher hap-Pigoorim*,¹ "Book of Apostasy"; and it was against this Don Isaac Abrabanel² wrote a refutation, and not against the *Hebraemastix*, as we believed formerly. It was Don Vidal (Ferrer) who wrote against the latter, naming his book *Qodesh haq-Qodashim*.³

Many poems were also written at this time with a polemical tendency, but of rather a personal character. The following compositions are worth mentioning. Joseph Albo, whom we have already noticed, wrote in Spanish an account of his controversy with a great dignitary of the Church. Don David Nasi, teacher and friend of Bishop Francisco Bentivoglio, published a treatise, in which he proves from the New Testament the truth of Judaism and the inconsistent character of Christianity.⁴ The author of the first biblical concordance, Isaac ben Qalonymos of the family of Nathan (Bongodas) composed two polemical treatises,⁵ and probably in order to make the Old Testament more accessible to Jews as well as Christians, both of whom naturally needed such a work for controversial purposes, decided upon the composition of his concordance. Isaac Nathan, as well as Joseph ben Shem-Tob, had frequent

ס' הפקורים¹

² See p. 194.

³ קדיש הקדושים, in manuscript.

⁴ הוראת בעל דין, Frankfurt à M., 1866.

⁵ מבצר יצחק and תוכחת מטה, both lost at present.

intercourse with Christian notabilities, and were obliged to discuss religious matters. Joseph wrote a philosophical commentary on Profeit Duran's satirical poem against converts,¹ in which he gives his own short disputation (p. 9), with a learned Christian against the doctrine of the Trinity as a hypostasis of the Divine attributes. He refutes also the Christian application of Plato's theory of ideas by Occam and by Raymundus Lull in his *Philosophia nova*. He translated also Hasdai Cresca's Spanish controversy into Hebrew.

Hayyim ben Musa, of Bejar, was another polemical author, who deserves to be better known than he is. He chiefly refutes Nicolaus de Lyra in his work called *Shield and Sword*.² He gives the following advice to Jews who have to undertake religious controversy. They should keep always to the literal meaning of Scripture, and reject allegory, which latter is the Christian motto. They should not accept the Aramaic and Greek translations, which put weapons into the hands of the Christian controversialists. Finally, they should declare plainly that the Agadah has no authority in religious matters. Indeed, if these judicious rules are adhered to, no controversy is possible. The two Durans (Simeon and his son Solomon) at Algiers (both refugees from Spain) were the last authors of the Spanish school, unless we include in that school Don Isaac Abrabanel, who came from Portugal. Simeon's theological work, *Bow and Shield*,³ has chapters on Christianity and Islam, where he takes up the defence of the Thorah against the objections of these two daughters of Judaism. He was very well versed in the New Testament writings, which he read in Latin or perhaps in the Hebrew translation of Shem-Tob ben Shaprut. Solomon Duran wrote a refutation

¹ אָנָרֶת אֶל תְּהִי כַּאֲבוֹתִיךְ, Constantinople, 1570.

² מִנְן וּרְמִיחָה, MS. See Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, viii. p. 430.

³ קִשְׁתָּה וּמִנְן, Livorno, 1785.

against Geronimo Santa Fé's attack on the Talmud.¹ So did Don Isaac Abrabanel against Geronimo's *Hebraeomastix* in Hebrew.²

Isaac Polgar and Joseph Shallum³ composed Refutations against Abner's⁴ polemical writings.

There were now no longer any Jews in Spain, Portugal, or France, who could be driven into controversy. The Inquisition had other methods to employ against the unhappy Marranos than peaceful polemics. Torquemada and his allies had no desire to increase controversial literature. The chief centre of the Jews was now in the Turkish provinces, where no controversy could be provoked by the Christians, in Poland, Austria, and Germany. Here it is true a convert of the name of Joseph Pfefferkorn, which he changed to Johannes on becoming a Christian, revived with the help of the Dominicans (about 1505), the old accusations against the Talmud and rabbinical writings, on behalf of which Reuchlin undertook a defence. No Jew was directly mixed up in this matter, and no disputation was arranged to take place; the controversy was confined to the Christians, and was conducted in Latin and in German.⁵

In Italy, where no early controversy is mentioned, we find in the fifteenth century a controversial treatise by Elijah Hayyim of Genzano against the Minorite Francesco; in the sixteenth century by Abraham Ferrussol of Avignon at Ferrara, Jair ben Sabbathai of Correggio, Leo of Modena, Solomon ben Moses ben Jekuthiel, and in the eighteenth century by Joshua Segre, and some other minor treatises.⁶

¹ Printed as an appendix to his father's work.

² "ישועת מישיחו," Carlsruhe, 1820.

³ MS. De Rossi, 533.

⁴ See p. 190.

⁵ Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, ix. p. 73, *seqq.*

⁶ See our Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library, 1886, s. v. וַיְכֹנֵן (second index).

In Poland there was, in 1572, some friendly controversy between the Unitarians and two Rabbis which produced a couple of books: (1) one by Jacob of Belziç, which is known from quotations; and (2) another¹ by the Karaite Isaac, son of Abraham Troki (of Trok near Wilna, composed about 1593). There is not much that is new here, all arguments against Christianity from the Old and New Testament being found in previous controversial books composed in Spain and mentioned above. But the Hebrew style of this book is more elegant, and it is written with more method than the older books of the kind. It had great success, so that it was translated into Latin, German, French and Spanish. It was admired by Voltaire, who says of the author:² Il a rassemblé sous cent propositions toutes les difficultés que les incrédules ont prodiguées depuis. . . . Enfin les incrédules les plus déterminés n'ont presque rien allegué qui ne soit dans ce rempart de la foi du rabin Isaac"; and Louis Duke of Orléans (died 1792), not being satisfied with the answer by Gousset, began more than one refutation of it, which however were left unfinished. With Isaac's book the important controversial literature in Hebrew ends.

Amongst the Marranos who took refuge in Holland we find some works in Spanish, by Orobio de Castro, under the title of *Prevensiones divinas contra la vana Idolatria de las gentes*, and *Tratado en qui se explica la prophesia de la 70 Semanas de Daniel*, 1675; by Saul Levy Mortera, in the book, with the title of *Providencia de Dios con Israel y verdad de la ley de Mosseh y Nullidad de las demas leyes*; by Elie Montalto, on the 53rd chapter of Isaiah; by Abraham Ger (Pelegrino?), under the title of *Fortalezza del Judaismo y confusion del estraño*, translated into Hebrew by Jacob Luzzatto; and by an anonymous author, the *Fuente clara*,

¹ Dr. Graetz, *Op. cit.*, ix. p. 490, *seqq.*

² De Rossi, *Bibl. Antichristiana*, p. 45.

printed in Hebrew characters. There is also a work in Italian, by Judah Briel, composed in the year 1702.¹

For 1800 years every word in the Bible has been turned and tortured for controversial purposes by Jews, Rabbanites and Karaites, as well as by Christians. The Talmuds and the Midrashim have been accused of being blasphemous, and of containing indecent matter, and have been several times condemned to be burned. There have been wholesale expulsions, massacres, and autodafés of the Jews in various parts of the world. Have those who tried in various ways to convert the Jews, succeeded in their task? No; for the Jews exist still, and are settled as peaceful and useful citizens in the lands from which they were once driven out. The drama is not yet finished; it still continues in some countries as a comedy under the name of anti-Semitism, and among the ringleaders are high dignitaries of the Church, whom we expect to preach the peace of religion, and semi-civilized, though eminent professors, whose duty is to educate as well as to teach. The fanaticism goes so far as to deny that Christians have received the Old Testament from the Jews,—to assert that Christians could dispense with it. The Jews, happily, have no longer to fear, even in barbarous and semi-barbarous countries, either wholesale massacre or expulsion. But they still suffer, and this is the last continuation of the controversies of the middle ages. The Talmud cannot now be burnt, it has been too often printed. But along with the rest of the rabbinical literature it is attacked by those who know the least about it, and who use expressions of vulgarity which we should not expect from men of the lowest class. For such writers the prophecy of Zephaniah (iii. 9), "For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language," is not yet accomplished.

A. NEUBAUER.

¹ See the preface of *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah*, etc., Oxford, 1877, and our Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian, 1886.

THE PROPHET JOEL.

THE prophet Joel, though not difficult to translate, is not quite easy to interpret. There is a certain want of circumstance and locality in the prophecy which has caused scholars to put very different constructions upon it. Some recent writers, indeed, have found the Book so vague and confused, that they have professed themselves unable to give any clear account of it. The points calling for attention are chiefly the following: (1) the general outline and contents of the prophecy; (2) its character, whether literal or allegorical; (3) the main religious ideas of the prophet; and (4), finally, the age or date at which he lived.

1. The Book consists of four chapters,—in the English version of three, the third chapter in Hebrew being reckoned part of the second. It falls into two general divisions at chap. ii. 18: “Then was the Lord jealous for His land.” All that precedes this point consists of words of the prophet, descriptions of plagues and exhortations to repentance; while all that follows is put into the mouth of the Lord, and consists of promises, partly of temporal and partly of spiritual blessings. The first division of the Book—the part spoken by the prophet—comprises two discourses, each of which, beginning with a graphic description of a plague, leads up to an exhortation to repentance. The first discourse occupies chap. i.; the second, chap. ii. 1–17. The prophet’s object in both is to move his countrymen to repentance, that the great judgments of God might be removed from them.

The words in which the prophet describes the calamity which was the occasion of his prophecy are something as follows:

“That which the shearer hath left, the swarmer hath eaten; and that which the swarmer hath left, the licker

hath eaten; and that which the licker hath left, the consumer hath eaten."

The writer certainly refers to locusts. Whether he means to describe locusts in general by such names, mentioning four kinds to express universality, or whether he means to describe the same swarm of locusts according to the advancing stages of its growth, is not of much consequence to decide. The latter theory has been advocated, as by Credner in his *Commentary*, but has little probability. In another passage (ii. 25) the same names are used, but in a different order, and the plague is represented as continuing through several years. If the same swarm were spoken of in different stages it could not be said that what one stage had left another had eaten, because the swarm moves onward without returning upon its own track. The prophet uses the various names—all denoting locusts—not strictly to describe distinct classes, but to indicate that many and successive swarms have invaded the land; and, put into prose, his language means, What one swarm hath left another hath eaten, and so on.

In his first discourse, chap. i., the prophet gives a graphic description of the calamity, to impress the minds of his hearers and carry them forward with him to that public humiliation and supplication to God which he desires to see. The country is desolate, and all sustenance for man and beast has disappeared. First, he begins with that luxurious use of God's benefits, which must now cease, but the cessation of which is the lowest form of calamity: "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine, for it is cut off from your mouth" (vv. 5-7). Then he passes to that which is a severer evil, to him and all religious men,—the interruption to the public service of God caused by the dearth and the devastations of the plague. This interruption of the fellowship between the land and Jehovah through the failure of

the sacrifices he throws into the figure of a young wife bereaved and in mourning. Addressing the land, he says, "Lament, like a virgin girdeth with sackcloth for the husband of her youth." The land is the virgin; the dreary, bleak aspect of it is the mourning which she wears. The bereavement lies in this: that through the cutting off of the meat offering and the drink offering the tokens of Jehovah's presence and favour, manifested in His acceptance of the offerings, have been removed; communications between the land and its God have been broken, and the land is bereaved (*vv. 3-10*). Finally, the third thing to which the prophet passes is the use of God's blessings for the sustenance of life, which now also must cease, and which is the sorest calamity of all: "Be ashamed, ye husbandmen, for the wheat and for the barley." The whole face of things is changed; the grains rot under the clods, the granaries are fallen down, the land is muffled in sackcloth, and the ruddy countenance of joy herself is become white—joy is withered away from the sons of men. And, having reached this climax, the prophet turns suddenly to the priests, bidding them consecrate a fast and cry unto the Lord, and himself dictating the words with which they are to go into God's presence: "Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand. Is not the meat cut off before our eyes? How do the beasts groan! The channels of waters are dried up, and fire has consumed the pasture-lands" (*vv. 13-20*).

The second discourse, chap. ii. 1-17, follows the same lines as the first, consisting of a brilliant picture of the plague under which the land suffers, and ending as before with an earnest appeal to all classes to humble themselves, that if possible, even after things have gone so far (ii. 12), the judgments of God may be removed. While the first discourse, however, dwelt chiefly on the desolation of the land from the locusts and drought—two plagues that usually accompany one another—the second is mainly occupied

with a description of the attack of the locusts themselves. Their appearance is as the appearance of horses ; their approach over the mountains sounds like the rattling of chariots, or the roar of a flame of fire, or the noise of a numerous people set in battle array. They run in the streets like mighty men, they keep their ranks like a disciplined host, they climb the wall like men of war, they go up into the houses and enter the windows like a thief. And the Lord uttereth His voice before His army, for His host is very great—for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible, and who can abide it ? And having drawn this alarming picture, the prophet exhorts his hearers : “ Yet even now, saith the Lord, turn ye unto Me with all your heart, with fasting and with weeping, and rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God : who knoweth whether He will not turn and repent ? ” And continuing his appeal he bids them call a solemn assembly of all the people, the old men, the children, the bridegroom and the bride, and let the priests intercede for the land : “ Spare Thy people, O Lord, and give not Thine heritage to reproach.”

Such are the contents of the first half of the Book. Some modern writers find a great want of clearness in it, especially in the references to the day of the Lord, which they think is not kept distinct from the other calamity, the events and drought in chap. i., and the invading army in chap. ii. Now unquestionably the day of the Lord is connected by the prophet with the other plagues, but it is not confounded with them. These plagues are not the day of the Lord, they are but the heralds and omens of it. The day of the Lord is the moment when He grasps the reins, which He seems to have held slackly before, when the currents of His moral rule, which had been running sluggishly, receive a mysterious quickening, and the Lord’s work upon the earth is at last fully performed. Such a

day of the Lord has of necessity two sides. To the sinners in Israel and to Israel's foes it is a day of darkness and terror; to them that look for Him it is eventually a day of gladness and deliverance, though to all the coming of Jehovah must have elements of terror. The advent of such a day was impressed on the hearts of men, but they were without knowledge of its time. They could only augur its approach from signs. Naturally any severe judgment or calamity awakened the thought of it, and it seemed the advanced post of the final terrors. Jehovah was near in the judgment, His goings might be heard, and speedily He would reveal Himself in His fulness. And therefore the prophet here connects the severe plagues under which the land lay in his time with that day: "Alas for the day, for the day of the Lord is at hand!" So far in chap. i., at least, there is no confusion. Equally distinct are the day of the Lord and the tokens of its nearness in the beginning of chap. ii.: "Blow the trumpet in Zion, for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand" (ii. 1). But in chap. ii. 10 the plague and the day of the Lord seem brought immediately together; for, after describing the assault of the army upon the city, the prophet says: "The earth quaketh before them, the heavens tremble, the sun and moon are darkened, . . . and the Lord uttereth His voice before His army; . . . for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible." Now this darkening of the sun and moon is not to be rationalised into the effects upon daylight produced by swarms of locusts in the sky, it is a sign of the near approach of the day of the Lord, though not identical with that day: "The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood *before* the great and terrible day of the Lord come" (ii. 31, Eng.). That the plague and the day of the Lord should be immediately connected is quite natural. For these hosts of locusts were the army of the Lord, as He Himself calls them, "My great army, which I

have sent upon you" (ii. 25), and He was at the head of the army, giving it command; and thus there was virtually that presence and manifestation of the Lord, at least in its beginnings, in which the day of the Lord was verified. It may not be easy to say, in regard to chap. ii., whether it be a prophecy of a new attack or an ideal account of a present one; for the description has many marks of poetical exaggeration. But in any case, seeing the invading host was the advanced post of the great day, it can readily be conceived how the prophet's imagination and presentiment should run out into a delineation of the day itself.

And thus we reach the second half of the Book, chap. ii. 18 to the end. This comprises a series of promises from the Lord, who is the speaker throughout. First, promises of temporal benefits, by which all the former calamities shall be reversed: "Behold, I will send you corn and oil and wine, and ye shall be satisfied therewith.¹ Fear not, O land, be glad and rejoice. Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field, for the pastures of the wilderness do spring. Be glad, ye children of Zion, . . . the floors shall be full of wheat, and the vats shall overflow with wine and oil." And, secondly, a promise that afterward the Spirit shall be poured out on all flesh, when all shall share the prophetic gift and be taught of God. And then shall come the great and terrible day of the Lord, ushered in by signs in heaven and in earth, the issue of which shall be that in Zion shall remain those that have escaped.

This third chapter (ii. 28-32, Eng.) states the result briefly; but one episode, contained strictly in the day of the Lord, has to be drawn out in fuller detail, the judg-

¹ There is a promise that rain shall be given "moderately" (A.V.), "in just measure" (R.V.), or, marg., "for righteousness." The word *cedakah* is nowhere else used except in an ethical or religious sense. The meaning here is probably "for" (in token of) righteousness, *i.e.* right standing before God, now restored. Comp. Job xxxiii. 26, "He restoreth unto man his righteousness" (*i.e.* the man's renewed health is God's practical justification of him).

ment on the heathen. This judgment is represented in chap. iv. (iii., Eng.). They are brought together and judged in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, "Jehovah judges." The judgment is a reaping of a harvest, and a treading of the winepress, amidst manifestations of the day of the Lord. And the issue is again stated: Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom a desolate wilderness; but Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem to all generations.

2. In regard to the literary character of the Book there used to be only two opinions, but to these there has lately been added a third of some interest. The three views are briefly: (1) That the prophecy is to be interpreted literally. The locusts in chap. i. are locusts; and the invading host in chap. ii., though represented with much poetical and pictorial rhetoric under the figure of a well disciplined force attacking a city, is also a host of locusts. This view carries with it the conclusion that the plague referred to was not future but present and experienced, and was the occasion of the prophecy; only the day of the Lord was really future. (2) The view has been prevalent, especially in ancient times, that the Book is allegorical, by locusts being meant heathen enemies of God's people. The four swarms have been thought to refer to the four monarchies mentioned in Daniel, or at least to four great foes of the kingdom of God. On this theory the whole prophecy belongs to the future of the prophet. (3) A recent theory has been advanced that the Book is apocalyptic. This class of literature deals especially with the future destinies of the people of God, with the eschatology of the kingdom. Dealing with this, it enters many times a supernatural region, bringing agencies and forces into operation that hardly belong to the earth or the life of man, but are rather embodiments of spiritual powers, whether of good or evil. According to this view the locusts of chap. i. are certainly locusts, but they are not the orthoptera of the desert, warp-

ing on the eastern wind, and darkening the sky of our natural day, they are apocalyptic locusts, belonging to the wonders of the time of the end, and crowding the atmosphere of the terrible day of the Lord. And the warriors of chap. ii. are neither locusts idealized nor yet human men of war, they are apocalyptic warriors, neither of the flesh of man nor beast. They belong to the terrible creations or manifestations of the last times. The idea of them may have been suggested by the northern host of Gog and Magog; but while the soldiers of Gog, however terrible, belong to this earth, these belong to another world.

The last two theories agree in throwing the whole Book into the prophet's future, the plague of chap. i. and chap. ii. are alike yet to come in his view. There are several objections that occur to this opinion. It cuts off all occasion for the prophecy, and makes it a mere learned study or *midrash* on preceding prophetic literature. The general character of prophecy is so unlike this, that very good evidence would be required to sustain such a theory. Again, the impression produced by chap. i. is certainly that the calamity to which the prophet refers is one which those whom he addresses had experienced. He asks, "Has this been in your days, or in the days of your fathers?" and bids his hearers tell it to their children, and their children to another generation. And when, at the end of the chapter, he exhorts the priests to lie all night in the temple in supplication, and bids them say, "Is not the meat cut off before our eyes? the seed is rotten under the clods, how do the beasts groan! the streams of water are dried up," is it possible that the things spoken of are future or figurative? or when, in the end of the second address, he bids the people turn in penitence to the Lord, saying, Who knows whether He will repent and return? is it probable that he is addressing an imaginary audience, which shall live at some distant date?

The allegorical theory considers the warriors of chap. ii. to be real soldiers, and the locusts of chap. i. to be a figure for heathen invaders of the kingdom of God. The apocalyptic theory holds that the locusts and warriors are both supernatural beings, but quite different from one another. Now as to the last point, the Book seems unmistakably to identify the plague of chap. i. with that of chap. ii. In ii. 11 it is said, "The Lord uttereth His voice before His army, for His host is very great"—that is, the warriors of chap. ii. But in ii. 25 it is said, "I will restore to you the years which the swarmer, the licker, the devourer, and the shearer have eaten, My great army which I sent among you." Here the locusts of chap. i. are expressly identified with the army of chap. ii. If then the army of chap. ii. be identical with the locusts of chap. i., and the prophet's two addresses be but rhetorical descriptions of the same plague, the question arises, Does he describe real warriors under the figure of locusts, or real locusts under the figure of warriors? If we do the prophet the justice of allowing him to speak for himself, the answer cannot be doubtful. He says of the army of the second chapter that their appearance is as the appearance of horses, and like horsemen so they run; they are as a numerous people set in battle array; they leap upon the city like mighty men, and enter in at the windows like a thief. No writer would tell us that horsemen were like horsemen, or thieves like thieves. And if these assailants are real soldiers, where is the blood which they shed, the captives they carry off, the flaming cities which they leave behind them? There is nothing of all this. The whole picture is merely the onward march of a host of insects, which nothing can resist, which rolls over fields and towns alike, crowding the streets and filling the houses—but doing nothing else. And when the Lord promises to restore the devastations inflicted by His great army, He does not engage to restore the captives whom they have carried off

or rebuild the cities which they have ruined—He promises to restore the years which His army has *eaten*. Of course if the invaders were apocalyptic warriors, the ghosts of the hordes of Gog and Magog, they might come and go, and leave little trace behind them ; one hardly knows what effects to expect from them. And perhaps when they had come and disappeared, it could only be said of them with Macbeth, The earth hath bubbles as the water hath, and these are of them.

3. The religious thoughts of the prophet are common to him with other prophets. If the prophecy were very ancient it would be interesting as being a kind of prophetic chart, which subsequent writers followed. If it be late, as modern writers are inclined to conclude, though it still has its interest, it loses the novelty and originality which would otherwise belong to it.

The main thought of the prophecy is the idea of the day of the Lord, a point of a time in the history of the world at which the Lord Himself shall interpose, revealing Himself as all that He is, and bringing to an end openly all the work which in more hidden ways He has been performing from the beginning. The day of the Lord is a day of terror and of blessing, the day of vengeance and the year of His redeemed ; its issue is the salvation of His people, and the destruction of all that disturb their peace. It is a sifting of His people and the judging of all their enemies round about. Most of the other thoughts of the prophecy arise out of this great conception ; for example, the idea of a *pel̄itah*, an escaped remnant, which shall constitute the saved at last. This idea is common to most of the prophets ; Isaiah in his first writing (chap. vi.) expresses it in the figure of a tree cut down, of which the stock remains with power to send forth new shoots. But each prophet, when predicting the destruction of the nation, predicts it with the reservation that the Lord will not wholly destroy His people—a

remnant shall return unto the Lord. Naturally in connexion with this the prophet gives prominence to the effective Divine call in salvation, saying, "And the residue are they whom the Lord shall call" (ii. 32); and he gives equal prominence to the faith of men on the other side, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Again he predicts more explicitly than others the pouring out of the Spirit, saying, that the Spirit shall be poured out on all flesh, and all shall prophesy and know the Lord. This is not a prediction of the *event* of Pentecost, but of the new order of things, of which Pentecost was the first great example. And when he says "all flesh," though the expression is usual for mankind as a whole, his subsequent analysis of the phrase, "your sons and daughters," "your old men and young men," "the servants and handmaids," suggests that he merely meant to include all classes and ranks in Israel. The imagery of the prophet is common in other prophets, and has been imitated in the New Testament; thus, his delineation of the day of the Lord reappears in our Lord's last discourse (Matt. xxiv. 29), and in the terrors that follow the opening of the sixth seal (Rev. vi. 12). The figures of the harvest and the winepress are adopted in Rev. xiv. 14; that of the locusts in Rev. ix; and the image of the fountain going forth from the house of the Lord (Zech. xiii., Ezek. xlviij.) is reproduced in the river of the water of life (Rev. xxii. 4).

Evidence for the age of the prophet is very uncertain, as Calvin felt, who remarked, "Quia nihil certi constat satius est tempus quo docuit in medio relinquere." On the other hand, Delitzsch has quite recently declared that the great antiquity of the prophecy is a "certainty." The difference of opinion that has prevailed on the subject is extraordinary. There is scarcely a point in the history, from the tenth century down to the year 400, at which the prophecy has

not been dated. And even more curious are the fluctuations of opinion observable in the same mind. In his Introduction Kuenen adhered to the opinion of Ewald, and placed the Book about the middle of the ninth century. In his *History of the Religion of Israel*, he threw Joel out of the list of witnesses who might be cited for the eighth century. In the later work, *The Prophets of Israel*, he dates the prophecy in the beginning of the sixth century, a few years before the exile; while his latest judgment is that the author was contemporary with Malachi.

It is agreed among scholars that Joel must either be a very early or a very late prophet. Credner and Ewald placed him about 860, and the view was followed by many. It was observed that Joel makes no allusions to Assyria nor to the Syrians, both referred to by Amos; and the inference was drawn that he lived before Assyria became formidable, and at a time when Syria and Israel had not lately been in collision. Further he makes no mention of a king, representing the government as in the hands of the priests and elders. These two facts were supposed to point to the time of the minority of king Joash, who, as a child of seven years, was placed on the throne under the tutelage of the high priest Jehoiada, about 877. The weakness of the argument, however, is apparent. It derives any strength which it has from the assumption that Joel is an early prophet, and must be placed somewhere high up in the history, and here is a niche suitable. But it is easy to turn the argument round. If Assyria and Chaldea are not mentioned, it may equally well be because they have passed off the stage of history as because they have not yet entered upon it. If no king of Israel is referred to, it is more likely to be because there was no king, and the government was really in the hands of the priestly nobles and the elders, as it was after the return from exile. Ewald relies upon the purity of the prophet's style as an

evidence of antiquity ; but the style is rather cultured and polished than powerful and original, and Reuss, who still adheres to the early date, confesses that the style is the only thing that suggests a later date to him.

The only arguments available are some general considerations, the preponderating weight of which, however, is in favour of a late date.

The prophet makes no allusion to Northern Israel, the people of God is Israel which dwells in Jerusalem. If the kingdom of the North had existed in Joel's day we should have expected allusions to it, as in all the prophets who are known to be early. Further, the prophet makes no reference to the conflict between the true, spiritual worship of Jehovah and false worship ; he mentions neither Baal, nor high places, nor idols, the work of men's hands ; although this conflict is just what fills the pages of all the earlier and even later prophets from Amos to Jeremiah. It would appear that in his day the opposition to the worship of Jehovah alone had been overcome in Judah. The prophet signalizes no great sins, such as idolatry, on the people's part ; they are sinful and need repentance, above all, there is need of the outpouring of the Spirit of God, but the grosser sins attacked by earlier prophets do not seem to have been prevalent. It is doubtful if such a state of things existed at any time prior to the restoration from exile.

And with this later date agrees the great devotion which the prophet shows to the ritual. At whatever time the ritual law was given to the people, it did not succeed in mastering their life till after the return. Joel regards the cessation of the ritual service as equivalent to a break in the union between the land and Jehovah. This is very unlike the way in which all other prophets down to Jeremiah speak of the sacrificial service.

The earlier prophets all play the game of high polities.

The occasion of their prophecies is something going on in the great world around, the menacing attitude of some foreign power, or the dangerous complications into which the State is bringing herself by alliances, or the hopes of freedom awakened by the combinations that are forming against some powerful oppressor such as Babylon. But the enemies of Israel alluded to by Joel are the petty tribes about, who do not threaten the existence or independence of the people, but make cruel raids upon their borders in order to recruit the slave market. The earlier prophets read the purposes of God, the nature of His Being, and the lessons of His providence in the great book of the history of the nations and their connexions with Israel; Joel has no such book before him, for Israel is no longer a nation, and he turns to the life of the community and its experiences under natural calamities, as drought and locusts, and reads lessons equally impressive there.

Though the people appears long restored, the restoration was still very incomplete; but the people shall yet be gathered to their former home, and though the great day of the Lord shall try them, "in mount Zion and Jerusalem shall be those that escape." And the day of Israel's redemption shall be the day when their enemies shall perish. In the earlier prophets it is some individual nation that is the foe of Israel, and on whom the vengeance of God is threatened, and thus the antithesis between Israel and the heathen is concrete and particular; but in this prophet the antagonism is generalized, it is between Israel and the world—"all nations" are gathered together to be judged in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

A FORGOTTEN POET.

HE lived in that strange twilight time when the old world was already dead and a new one waiting to be born. It was an age when all the ancient barriers that divided men seemed silently to fall away, and the waters of East and West, the Orontes and the Tiber, flowed into the common basin of a brimming and eddying civilization. The conquests of Alexander had united the East into a culture half-Greek, half-Asiatic; and Rome, which seemed to itself to have annexed and subjugated this magnificent territory, was in truth being assimilated to it and absorbed. And under that strong and tolerant rule the old distinctions of national prejudice and national faith were passing away. The brighter stars in the heaven of polytheism, each of which had separately attracted the aspirations and guided the destinies of a particular people, now melted one by one into a pantheistic haze. And not all distinctions only but all contradictions met and mingled in the complex pressure of that fulness of time—republicanism and imperialism in politics, stoicism and epicureanism in philosophy, and in religion the crudest tradition on the one hand with a new mysticism or magic on the other—all interfused, and none victorious. For accompanying all this wealth of suggestion and alternative poured out before mankind, was a deep dissatisfaction with them all. Outwardly, there was a world-wide and unexampled prosperity; but under this secure splendour of the free and cultured class, there extended everywhere the foul morass of slavery, festering and rotting from age to age. Yet as we read the literature of the time, the misery of the bondmen beneath is even less certain to us than is the despondency of the rich whom they served—the rich, smitten as they never had been smitten before with the curse of satiety. In the early days Homer and Herodotus reveal a world light-hearted as yet and in its youth

—a world to which the knowledge of good and evil had scarcely come. But in the age of which we speak—the age culminating in Tacitus and Juvenal—the whole atmosphere even of metropolitan culture is quivering with a consciousness of misery and loaded with the sense of sin.

In some year, to us unknown, of this the crowning slope of history, a man with Hebrew blood in his veins sat down to meditate in a city of the Eastern Mediterranean. He sat amid a glittering civilization which had oppressed and crushed the ancient hopes of his people. To a thinker in such circumstances scarcely any subject was possible except what a modern poet has called “the riddle of the painful earth.” And in the race to which our poet belonged, what had stimulated speculation from very early times was the practical paradox of life. “Wherefore do the wicked prosper?” they asked, and asked in vain; and kept silence, while inwardly the fire burned. So it was with him who now in a later day sits down to write, and dates his meditative vision “in the thirtieth year after the ruin of the city.” This ruin of the city was not that of Jerusalem by Titus. The writer may indeed have lived so late as to be a contemporary of the Flavian dynasty; but in his book he goes back for his surroundings to the old days of the Exile, and stands a poor captive amid “the wealth of them that dwell at Babylon.” “And my spirit was sore moved, so that I began to speak words full of fear to the Most High.” The words full of fear were not the eloquent ascriptions of praise with which he opens, though some of them are striking, as when he says, speaking of the revelation on Sinai, that “Thy glory went through four gates, of fire, and of earthquake, and of wind, and of cold.” They were rather his persistence in the daring challenge at the close. “Are their deeds then any better than inhabit Babylon, that they should therefore have the dominion over Sion? . . . Thou hast destroyed Thy people, and hast preserved Thine

enemies, and hast made no sign." But on this occasion the silence was to be broken. "The angel that was sent unto me, whose name was Uriel,"—the same Light of God, whom Milton long after introduces to us, as Regent of the Sun—"gave me an answer." And the answer was that which in all ages has repressed the speculative audacity of man. "Thy heart hath gone too far in this world, and thinkest thou to comprehend the way of the Most High?" But the reply was firm, "Yea, my Lord."

"And he answered me and said, I am sent to show thee three ways, and to set forth three similitudes before thee, whereof if thou canst declare me one, I will show thee also the way that thou desirest to see, and I shall show thee from whence the wicked heart cometh. And I said, Tell on, my lord. Then said he unto me, Go thy way, weigh me the weight of the fire, or measure me the blast of the wind, or call me again the hour that is past.

"Then answered I and said, What man is able to do that, that thou shouldest ask such things of me?

"And he said unto me, If I should ask thee how great dwellings are in the midst of the sea, or how many springs are in the beginning of the deep, or how many springs are above the firmament, or which are the outgoings of paradise: peradventure thou wouldest say unto me, I never went down into the deep, nor as yet into hell, neither did I ever climb up into heaven. Nevertheless now have I asked thee but only of the fire and wind, and of the day wherethrough thou hast passed, and of things from which thou canst not be separated, and yet canst thou give me no answer of them.

"He said moreover unto me, Thine own things, and such as are grown up with thee, canst thou not know; how should thy vessel then be able to comprehend the way of the Highest, and, the world being now outwardly corrupted, to understand also the corruption that is evident in my sight?"

The way of the Highest—the whole ways of God with men, on the one hand; and the way the wicked heart cometh, or the origin of evil, on the other. Such were the hard and high matters which this thinker is charged with aspiring to; and he does not deny it. Nor can he refute the ever-recurring and baffling argument that even the smallest thing—the flower in the crannied wall, the apple

that tumbles from the tree—are to us absolutely incomprehensible. He cannot refute it, and he does not attempt refutation. But he does not retreat. He stands, Prometheus-like, upon the rock to which he is chained ; and the sternest and saddest of all those

“ Grey spirits, yearning in desire
To follow knowledge, like a sinking star,
Beyond the utmost bound of human thought.”

might have spoken to Heaven the words that follow.

“ Then said I unto him,

“ It were better that we were not at all, than that we should live still in wickedness, *and to suffer, and not to know wherefore.*”

Into so brief an utterance is crushed much of the pain of many a generation in the past, and some of that which preys upon the heart to-day. Let us not forget that, with all its sullen honesty, and all its outspoken rebelliousness, it is spoken not away from but to a Divine messenger, and with a secret hope on the human side of the colloquy that the heavenly visitant may yet reveal the secret of the higher world. Uriel refuses ; and his next voice is a warning parable. The trees, he says, took counsel to make war against the sea, that it might depart and leave room for more woods ; and the floods took counsel against the forest, that it rather might yield and let the sea flow over another plain. “ If thou wert judge, which of these wouldest thou condemn ? ” He answers that they have both devised a foolish thought. And the reply is only too ready : “ Like as the ground is given unto the wood, and the sea to the floods ; even so they that dwell upon the earth may understand nothing but that which is upon the earth, and He only that dwelleth upon the heavens may understand the things that are above the height of the heavens.” Once more the gates of the unseen clash together, and shut us out with the poet-prophet who stood upright upon the

threshold, but ventures to stand no longer. Yet if he falls, he falls only upon his knees, and when he speaks it is in a tone of more passionate and prevailing entreaty. I have never read without deep emotion the words which follow :

"I beseech Thee, O Lord, let me have understanding : for it was not my mind to be envious of the high things, but of such as pass by us daily, namely, wherefore Israel is given up as a reproach to the heathen, and for what cause the people whom Thou hast loved is given over unto ungodly nations, and why the law of our forefathers is brought to nought, and the written covenants come to none effect, and we pass away out of the world as grasshoppers, and our life is astonishment and fear, and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. What will He then do unto His name whereby we are called ? Of these things have I asked."

And the pathetic prayer is heard. Not indeed without an intimation that "the more thou searchest, the more thou shalt marvel," for this world (or *eon*, the word being used in the sense so familiar to us in the New Testament) cannot comprehend the good time to come. But something of the future "the affable archangel" promises to tell. And on the whole the coming vision is a dark one—dark, but with one flash of the brightest light across it later on. Whence comes the darkness ? Evil, he says, was sown long ago, and the harvest of it must be cut down and swept away before comes the time of good.

"For the grain of evil seed hath been sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much ungodliness hath it brought up unto this time ? and how much shall it yet bring forth until the time of threshing come ? Ponder now by thyself, how great fruit of wickedness the grain of evil seed hath brought forth. And when the ears shall be cut down, which are without number, how great a floor shall they fill ?"

The appalling vision drives the inquirer out of his newly attained self-repression and modesty ; for after asking, "How and when shall these things come to pass ?" he cannot forbear his old *de profundis* sigh, "Wherefore are our

days few and evil?" And Uriel's answer, reminding us that the sigh is older than the days of Jerusalem or of Babylon, reminds us also, as many things in this book do, that it has arisen in every later land and time. As we turn these ancient pages we seem to hear the muffled tread of the long procession of the generations of men, who have fallen like the leaves of the forest—*fortes ante Agamemnona*, sages earlier than Thales, and lovers of wisdom before Pythagoras; young men with hope in their hearts and light upon their foreheads; old men who fixed their eyes upon a fast vanishing goal, and held it not too late to seek a newer world—all, whose names we know not, whose very existence we forget, with all their glowing visions, all their proud hopes, all their burning convictions, all their daring convictions: all perished and past, and mingled now in the undistinguishable dust of death. For what answer does the Hebrew sage report as made to him from above? "Did not the souls of the righteous ask question of these things in their chambers, saying, How long shall I hope on this fashion? when cometh the fruit of the floor of our reward?"

Hebrew speculation, we see, clings and eddies around righteousness and its hope of harvest. For it also has a harvest; and the answer made to its hope of fulfilment is, "The day shall come when the number of the seeds is filled in you; for God hath weighed the world in a balance." Then Esdras breaks in with the suggestion that it is our sins—that of his generation—which prevents the floor of the righteous from being filled with harvest. But even this penitential thought is gravely put aside by the angel. There is a deeper mystery than that. "In the grave"—the great unseen around us—"the chambers of souls are like the womb of a woman": those shadowy chambers make haste to deliver their burden, but they cannot till the appointed time. So he again makes request, "Show me whether

there be more to come than is past, or more past than is to come"; and in vision he is answered that the past is far longer, and the time to come is short. "Then I prayed, and said, May I live, thinkest thou, until that time? or what shall happen in those days?" As to the prophet's own life the angel could say nothing; as to the latter days he closes his visit by the announcement of a dark day at hand, when "the way of truth shall be hidden, and the land shall be barren of faith, and iniquity shall be increased" beyond what the world has known. And in this evil time, after the third trumpet heard, there shall fall out many ominous signs: "blood shall drop out of the wood, and the stone shall give his voice . . . and salt waters shall be found in the sweet." But these are not to be the signs of a gracious change, but of a deeper moral desolation. For

"Then shall wit hide itself, and understanding withdraw itself into his secret chamber, and shall be sought of many, and yet not be found: then shall unrighteousness and incontinency be multiplied upon earth. One land also shall ask another, and say, Is righteousness that maketh a man righteous gone through thee? And it shall say, No. At the same time shall men hope, but nothing obtain: they shall labour, but their ways shall not prosper."

And with these chilling and desolating words the angel leaves him, not so much "dazzled and sunk with colloquy sublime," as paralysed with "extreme fearfulness" at the unrelieved sadness of the unfinished revelation.

Before going on to the second fytte or dialogue or dream of this mystic poem, one thing may be noticed. Its speculations on the vision of the world, and all the wonder that will be, are moulded and coloured throughout by the strongest nationalism. In older times this was not always so even with men of the same separate and sacred blood. The poetic plaints of Job, and the large-thoughted murmurs of the Ecclesiast, had and have an authority to

which our apocryphal writer never attained : but they deal with the problem of the world in the most general terms—neither starting from, nor returning to, nor in any respect hampered by Jewish nationality, or even Jewish history. It was otherwise now, and this adds deeply to the pathos of what we go on to read. The Roman empire, it was said long ago, made the human race for the first time feel that it was one ; but to the later Hebrew this consummation, now at its height, looked like the extinction of all his hope. To him and to his special aspirations, cosmopolitanism meant death.

The man whose writings we are tracing was indeed no vulgar Jew. In his eyes the prosperity of his people was closely associated with that of the world. And the prosperity, alike of the world and of Israel, could not in his view be merely external or secular—it was based upon “righteousness that maketh a man righteous,” and it was to be the righteous man’s reward. Nor was it to be of this world alone. The good time coming was to be in a future world—a Divine age; after death had passed even upon the Messiah and after judgment had passed upon all men. Yet with all this larger scope and deeper vision, here is how, after seven days’ fasting, he begins “to talk with the Most High again.”

“O Lord that bearest rule, of every wood of the earth, and of all the trees thereof. Thou hast chosen Thee one only vine : and of all lands of the whole world Thou hast chosen Thee one pit : and of all the flowers thereof, one lily : and of all the depths of the sea Thou hast filled Thee one river : and of all builded cities Thou hast hallowed Sion unto Thyself : and of all the fowls that are created Thou hast named Thee one dove : and of all the cattle that are made Thou hast provided Thee one sheep : and among all the multitudes of people Thou hast gotten Thee one people, and to this people, whom Thou lovest. Thou gavest a law that is approved of all. And now, O Lord, why hast Thou given this one people over unto many ?”

And then he adds this bitter-sweet reproach, “ If Thou

didst so much hate Thy people, yet shouldest Thou punish them with Thine own hands”—a word whose too great daring is atoned for by the greater word of the immediate Divine answer: “Thou art sore troubled in mind for Israel’s sake; *lovest thou that people better than He that made them?*” And his reply puts the thing again on its true footing: “No, Lord; but of very grief have I spoken; for my reins pain me every hour, while I labour to comprehend the way of the Most High and to seek out part of His judgment.” Once more to this immemorial complaint comes back the ancient answer, “Thou canst not”: and both voices then pass off into that more poetic strain which I have sought to untwist as often as I may from this book’s too closely compacted thought.

“And I said, Wherefore, Lord? whereunto was I born then? or why was not my mother’s womb then my grave, that I might not have seen the travail of Jacob, and the wearisome toil of the stock of Israel? And He said unto me, Number Me the things that are not yet come, gather Me together the drops that are scattered abroad, make Me the flowers green again that are withered, open Me the places that are closed, and bring Me forth the winds that in them are shut up, show Me the image of a voice: and then I will declare to thee the thing that thou labourest to know.”

In the remainder of this vision Esdras presses first for the *hastening* of the future; and this is met by the immovable answer, “I will liken My judgment to a ring; like as there is no slackness of the last, even so there is no swiftness of the first.” And then he presses again for the *revelation* of the future; and though this is delayed and obscured, still “tokens” of the final change are given him, and he is able to hope that after the time of hard and icy unbelief with which his last vision closed is past, a better morn shall break. “Whosoever remaineth from all these that I have told thee shall escape, and see My salvation, and the end of your world.”

“Whosoever remaineth!”—but how many shall remain,

how many of the generations of men, past, present, and to come, shall see life and good? The third vision is filled with speculations on this which have always reminded me (chiefly perhaps because I read the two books originally at nearly the same time) of our Laureate's *In Memoriam*. That great poem of our age takes its rise in sorrow for the death of a particular friend—a sorrow which in the first instance refuses to be diverted, even for purposes of solace, to more general considerations:—

"That loss is common would not make
My own less bitter,—rather more:
Too common! never morning wore
To evening, but some heart did break."

But as the poem moves on, it spreads and grows like a river, with larger reaches and more sweeping curves. Less and less it is found to be "private sorrow's barren song," until at the last the poet closes his speculations on the destiny of man with the words to his friend:—

"Behold I dream a dream of good,
And mingle all the world with thee!"

In the case of our great contemporary the stimulus to doubt and speculation is found, first in the frustration of youthful hopes by death, but later on in the hard and heavy revelations which modern science seems to make. The poet turns his ear to listen to

"The murmur of the homeless sea,
The sound of streams that swift or slow
Draw down aeonian hills, and sow
The dust of continents to be."

He strains his eyes to discern the myriad life which those continents have during successive millenniums imprisoned in their stony bosom, and he finds that nature, while seemingly sometimes careful of the type, is ever "careless of the single life," and sweeps generation after generation

out of her way with savage prodigality. And so it is with a burdened mind and a troubled heart that he rises to the aspiration :—

“ Oh still we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood ;

That nothing walks with aimless feet ;
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.”

The older poet, in his sadder, darker time, had far more pressing calamities without, while within there was the pressure of creed—and that the narrow creed of a race. The very opening speech of this third vision ends with these amazing yet pathetic words :

“ Thou, O Lord, madest the world for our sakes. As for the other people, which also come of Adam, Thou hast said that they are nothing, but be like unto spittle : and hast likened the abundance of them unto a drop that falleth from a vessel. And now, O Lord, behold these heathen, which have ever been reputed as nothing, have begun to be lords over us, and to devour us. But we Thy people, whom Thou hast called Thy first-born, Thy only begotten, and Thy fervent lover, are given into their hands. If the world now be made for our sakes, why do we not possess an inheritance with the world ? how long shall this endure ? ”

Nothing can be stronger than his protest for Jewish exclusiveness and against cosmopolitanism ; yet we see it leaves him in doubt, on more sides than one. And among the many things fitted in that age to cause such doubts, there was one above all. Wherever men of that race now met and congregated, it was whispered that a new sect was to be found among them, in Jerusalem or in Antioch, who welcomed cosmopolitanism, and even professed to combine it in some marvellous form with the faith of their Hebrew fathers. Inconceivable as it was, the new men did this—

and they did more. They held to Messiah, not coming but come; and this Jewish Messiah they actually offered to the world. In quoting this book of Esdras, I have taken nothing from the two first or the two last chapters, which are supposed to be Christian additions to the original book. But even in that part of it where interpolation is not suspected, or from which it has been removed by criticism, there seem to me to be signs of a certain acquaintance, if not with Christianity, at least with Christian ideas. This applies to the very part with which we are now dealing, and to the important declaration in it of what is to happen in the winding up of this world or æon previous to the final judgment.

"Behold, the time shall come, that these tokens which I have told thee shall come to pass, and the bride shall appear, and she coming forth shall be seen, that now is withdrawn from the earth. And whosoever is delivered from the foresaid evils shall see my wonders. For My son shall be revealed with those that be with him, and they that remain shall rejoice within four hundred years. After these years shall My son the Christ die, and all men that have life. And the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the former judgments: so that no man shall remain. And after seven days the world, that yet awaketh not, shall be raised up, and that shall die that is corrupt. And the earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell in silence, and the secret places shall deliver those souls that were committed unto them."

In the early Christian Churches, with the Eastern half of which this book was a great favourite, "My son," in the fifth line above, was changed into "My son Jesus," and the whole volume, with a much earlier date ascribed to it, was received as an ancient Jewish writing, anticipating Christian ideas. That such ideas were in the air around the writer I cannot doubt. How far they, and especially the idea that salvation might be no longer a national matter, were consciously present to him, or pressing upon him, no one can say. It is certain that they were not accepted so as to substitute for his dejection the new

enthusiasm of hope which men of his own blood were at that moment rousing in every city around the Mediterranean Sea. On the contrary, this man, hedged in like most of his race, but rising above them in moral stature, was by that very fact doomed to an outlook of greater sadness than they. For his faith was fixed on a future judgment of the just and of the unjust (not merely of nation and nation), and a vision of this follows. (It is contained chiefly in a missing fragment, extending to some eighty verses, which has only been discovered during the present century, and should be inserted between the 35th and 36th verses of the seventh chapter in the Vulgate edition of the Latin and its English translation.) But if all nations except Israel are to be rejected, and if even Israel is to be sifted by the Divine judgment, who then can stand? Esdras asks whether in that day the prayers of the good may not avail to avert the doom of the bad, and receiving an unwelcome answer from above, he replies bluntly in the characteristic words, "This is my first and last saying, that it had been better not to have given the earth unto Adam; or else, when it was given him, to have restrained him from sinning." And then, in his freer and more poetic vein, he breaks out into a magnificent lamentation:—

"O thou Adam, what hast thou done? For though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we all that come of thee. For what profit is it unto us, if there be promised us an immortal time, whereas we have done the works that bring death? And that there is promised us an everlasting hope, whereas ourselves being most wicked are made vain? And that there are laid up for us dwellings of health and safety, whereas we have lived wickedly? And that the glory of the Most High is kept to defend them which have led a wary life, whereas we have walked in the most wicked ways of all? And that there should be showed a paradise, whose fruit endureth for ever, wherein is security and medicine, since we shall not enter into it? (For we have walked in evil places.) And that the faces of them which have used abstinence shall shine above the stars, whereas our faces shall be blacker than darkness?"

From this height again he plunges into speculations on the number of them that be saved and of them that perish. The latter, he believes, exceeds the former as a wave is greater than a drop ; or, as the Divine answer to him puts it, "The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few." And this is confirmed to him by a figure. "When thou askest the earth, it shall say unto thee, that it giveth much mould whereof earthen vessels are made, but little dust of which comes gold." This simile is merely touched in passing, but another which follows is dwelt upon with more detail of reasoning. It is the same which had such a fascination for the young Cambridge poet, when a broken friendship led him to thoughts of immortality, and when his hopes of immortality were chilled by the immeasurable waste—the reckless and unbounded destruction—of the germs of life, which we see all around us, and which we see not less but more in the geologic years gone by. I, says Tennyson, speaking of nature,—

" But I considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And finding that, of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,

I falter where I firmly trod,
And falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar-stairs
That slope through darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith."

The hands of faith of our old Hebrew were fettered rather than lame. He belonged to a race which has always sought success in this life, and which in those old days is supposed to have looked to this life for the rewards even of righteousness—a race which, a great English bishop has argued, never had at any time either the promise or the hope of a life to come. Yet this man, living in an age when his

people were ground to the dust by calamities, and when their promise for this world seemed to have failed, never shows, from beginning to end of his writing, the least doubt of his own immortality, or of that of all around him. Throughout he speaks to God in the consciousness that all live unto Him, and shall live unto Him, and abide His judgment in that world to be. The doubt and the difficulty of our poet-prophet is how that judgment is to be passed—not by himself, for to himself and those who with him are faithful there comes a wonderful word of promise; but by the masses of mankind who are sown carelessly in the furrows of time and bring forth no fruit to God. And for them he pleads, before any word uttered for himself. His petition is strange. He pleads, as to them, that God would ignore them, would forget them, would turn His face from them as though they had not been—that He would remember only those whose pilgrimage has been towards salvation and reward. And if his prayer is not wholly accepted, so neither is it wholly thrown aside. And in the high and dark answer comes in again the simile of the seed and the souls of men. “Some things thou hast spoken aright, . . . and so shall it come to pass. For as the husbandman soweth much seed upon the ground, . . . even so is it of them that are sown in the world—they shall not all be saved.” Then Esdras makes the last speech to which we shall listen from him.

“If I have found grace, let me speak. Like as the husbandman’s seed perisheth, if it come not up, and receive not Thy rain in due season: or if there come too much rain, and corrupt it: even so perisheth man also, which is formed with Thy hands, and is called Thine own image, because Thou art like unto him, for whose sake Thou hast made all things, and likened him unto the husbandman’s seed. Be not wroth with us, but spare Thy people, and have mercy upon Thine own inheritance: for Thou art merciful unto Thy creature.

Then answered He me, and said, Things present are for the present, and things to come for such as be to come. For thou comest far short that thou shouldest be able to love My creature more than I: but I

have oftentimes drawn nigh unto thee, and unto it, but never to the unrighteous."

And after this sovereign word he is charged to ask no more questions as to "the multitude of them that perish," or as to the degree in which they fail and come short of what might have been their destiny; but to open his ears to the heavenly hope which comes to himself and those who are like him. And what follows has always appeared to me to sound like the voice of

"Lyric Love,
Half angel and half bird,
And all a wonder and a world's desire!"

It rises and soars above all the troubled speculation of this book as a lark springs out of a thundercloud.

"For unto you is paradise opened, the tree of life is planted, the time to come is prepared, plenteousness is made ready, a city is builded, and rest is allowed, yea, perfect goodness and wisdom. The root of evil is sealed up from you, weakness and the moth is hid from you, and corruption is fled into hell to be forgotten; sorrows are passed, and in the end is showed the treasure of immortality."

With this third vision ends what seems to me the characteristic and seminal part of a book accessible to all, but surely too much forgotten in our day. What remains is occupied with an answer, through the means of successive apocalyptic symbols, to the question put, "At what *time* shall these final marvels happen?" The meaning is hard to gather, and not valuable when attained, though an exception ought to be made for the very first scene described. Here Esdras, dwelling seven days in "a field of flowers, where no house is builded," sees at last a woman with her clothes rent, loudly lamenting. She had been barren thirty years, and had then borne one son, and brought him up, and when the time came for his marriage, she made a feast. But when he rose from it and entered into his wedding-chamber, he fell down and died, and now she sat upon the ground

continually, no more to eat and drink till the end. The prophet tries to console her and reason with her, in vain ; but “ while I was talking with her, her face shined exceedingly, so that I was afraid of her, and suddenly she made a great cry very fearful, so that the earth shook at the noise, and I looked, and behold, the woman appeared unto me no more, but there was a *City* builded.” The woman and the city no doubt represented Sion, which the seer loved from the days of old ; but was it still Sion in the narrow and national limitation ? Or was there in his mind some dawning of the vision of that greater city, the invisible foundations of which were even then being laid in every people around—a city bounded by no walls, circumscribed by no charter, vassal to no land of earth ; a city whose gates stand four-square, and are open day and night continually, that the righteous nation may enter in ; and yet, as it should seem, may enter not wholly, as he once thought, because of their righteousness, for the many-tongued “ people that dwell therein are forgiven their iniquity ”?

A. TAYLOR INNES.

ADVICE ABOUT COMMENTARIES.

I. THE PENTATEUCH AND JOSHUA.

SEVERAL papers entitled “ Notes on Commentaries,” appeared some ten years ago in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR, and it has been considered desirable to include in the present series a few articles on the aids available for the use of the student, in the shape of commentaries and subsidiary works upon the books of the Old Testament. The object of the present article is to introduce the subject by giving a sketch of the literature on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, especially in relation to the controversies still pending with respect to the composition and authorship of those books.

Dr. Samuel Cox took occasion, in the former set of papers, to warn at the outset “ the inexperienced student ” of the inutility

of consulting for purposes of real Biblical study the general commentaries on the Bible (popular still in some quarters) by Matthew Henry, Gill, Thomas Scott, Adam Clarke, Albert Barnes, etc. The writer of the present article must endorse Dr. Cox's opinion on this point. It may be admitted that there is a distinct value, especially from a devotional standpoint, in having the whole of the Sacred Books expounded by a single commentator. But the books of the Bible are so varied in their scope and import, and touch upon such a vast range of subjects, that it is impossible for a single commentator to do them at all adequate justice, especially when viewed in the light of modern investigation.

Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, late Bishop of Lincoln, when Canon of Westminster, was the last man of mark to undertake the Herculean task of writing singlehanded a commentary on all the books of the Bible. As a New Testament scholar, Bishop Wordsworth occupied a high position, and his commentary on the books of the Old Testament, even when erroneous from a rigidly exegetical or critical point of view, often contains suggestive thoughts. The student preparing popular addresses will scarcely ever fail to consult Bishop Wordsworth's commentary without profit, although he may be startled at the extraordinary manner in which the text is sometimes interpreted. The good Bishop, after the manner of the ancient Rabbis, not unfrequently discovers "miracles" in places where the ordinary reader would not suspect their existence, and the naive way in which he constantly ventilates his theories of "apostolical succession" and "sacramental grace," while commenting on the historical narratives of the Old Testament, is often amusing. There are, however, occasionally important notes, even upon the results of the modern critical school. But the reader will not unfrequently fall into serious blunders if he attempts to judge the great modern critics from the allusions which Bishop Wordsworth makes to their writings, or fancies himself able to rebut the arguments of the theologians of the modern school of criticism from the materials furnished in the Bishop's commentary. That commentary is, however, in many respects valuable, and not least because of the information given as to the patristic interpretations of the Old Testament. It is unnecessary to say that it is pervaded by a deep reverence for the Sacred Writings.

Several laudable attempts have been made in England to pro-

due, by the combined efforts of a number of scholars, a high class commentary on the books of the Bible. The final results as yet attained have not been altogether so successful as expected. The execution of all such tasks is beset with more difficulties than is generally imagined. An editor has to secure the co-operation of a number of able scholars among whom the work has to be portioned. In the effort to obtain scholars whose names and position might serve as a guarantee to the public, it has not unfrequently happened that men have been pressed into the service who were really unable, by reason of the pressure of other occupations, to discharge the task, or who were sometimes even unqualified for it. A scholar may attain high eminence in one department of theology, and yet be disqualified by taste or training for the work of a commentator. To attain excellence in any department it is necessary that a writer should possess a real interest and enthusiasm for the work in which he may be engaged. It has been well said of old, "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it: if a man would give all the substance of his house for love, it would utterly be contemned" (Cant. viii. 7). It is not easy to secure real enthusiasm. Contract work rarely attains the excellence reached by books which are the natural outcome of a scholar's natural tastes and love for the subject. An able theologian may be induced by the pressure of some editor to turn aside from his favourite pursuits to engage in some uncongenial task. He may flatter himself that in doing so he will be able to revive an acquaintance with studies long laid aside on the shelf or generally abandoned. But the result of such work will rarely prove to be of the highest class, even though the scholar himself be a man of eminence.

The publication of the first parts of Bishop Colenso's work, *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua*, London, 1862, following as that work did immediately after the excitement produced in England by the issue of the *Essays and Reviews* (1861), gave a shock to the religious public, and an impetus to Biblical studies throughout the country. A revered Christian champion of by-gone days, Professor Dr. Augustus Tholuck, remarked to the writer, when he visited him at Halle in 1863, that although he did not agree with Bishop Colenso, he was convinced that the publication of his work would prove a real blessing to England. Nothing short of the alarm caused by such publications would suffice, in Professor

Tholuck's opinion, to stir up the religious public in England to the importance of thorough Biblical research. The publication of the concluding portions of Bishop Colenso's work, which was completed in 1879, were little noticed by the general public. But the early parts burst like an avalanche on the English public, and aroused quite a religious storm.

Old Testament studies had fallen at that time so far into arrear, that it was impossible that such an onslaught on the Old Testament could be received with composure. The attack was for the time felt to be stronger than the defence. So intense was the general excitement, that in 1863 the then Speaker of the House of Commons consulted several of the English Bishops as to the best way of supplying the deficiency which was felt to exist in English Biblical literature. The result was that the Archbishop of York undertook to organize a plan for producing a high-class commentary on the Bible by the co-operation of scholars specially selected for their Biblical learning. The editorship of the work was ultimately committed into the hands of the Rev. Canon F. C. Cook, and the first volumes of the commentary, embracing the Pentateuch, were published by Mr. Murray, in 1871. It was distinctly stated in the prospectus of the work that "the great object of such a commentary must be to put the general reader in full possession of whatever information may be requisite to enable him to understand the Holy Scripture, to give him, as far as possible, the same advantages as the scholar, and to supply him with satisfactory answers to objections resting upon misrepresentation of the text."

The *Speaker's Commentary* was thus specially designed from the outset to be distinctly apologetic. Its object was not so much to expound the meaning of the sacred writers, as to defend their writings from the attacks of modern sceptics. The object with which the work was undertaken was one of the causes of its comparative failure. A high-class commentary ought to have a higher aim than to defend the Scriptures from attack. It must be noted that the force of all such attacks is in most cases exhausted before it is possible to produce any effective reply. Moreover Bishop Colenso's objections could not be thoroughly replied to in the notes of a popular commentary. Hastily composed as was the work of Colenso, and coarsely defiant and polemical as was its tone, it was not abreast of the state of Pentateuch investigation.

The most damaging answer to that work, from the standpoint of the scholar, would have been to have pointed out that fact, and thus to have exposed the presumption of the assailant. But to do so efficiently, it would have been necessary to concede more than the religious public (uninformed as they were on the subject) were then prepared to surrender. It is peculiarly unpleasant for a scholar who comes forward as a defender of Holy Writ, to be assailed himself with the charge of "Rationalism." The *Speaker's Commentary* was compelled, of course, to attempt the defence of popular views, although its writers seem to have felt in many places the weakness of that position. The commentary, therefore, was fated to disappoint all parties concerned. The student desiderated more information and a bolder grasp of the subject, while the general public wanted short and easily understood replies to the novel objections raised against the Pentateuch. The bulky volumes of *Bishop Colenso's Life* by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart., just issued from the press, are likely to revive this controversy; especially as that work contains very concise summaries of the Bishop's argumentation; and it is unquestionable that, however wrong-headed Colenso may have been, there was much innate nobility in his character.

A scholar is often compelled to admit that on certain points his information extends but a little way. Although he may be convinced of the creed he professes, it is impossible to assert facts when little or no evidence can be adduced in their favour, or when such evidence as is available appears for the moment to tell in the other direction. Like a skilful general his duty is to defend some position which is really strong, rather than invite defeat and disaster by extending his forces over too wide an area in defence of a number of weak positions. The believing critic is often terribly hampered in the defence of Scripture by the ignorance which many of the clergy exhibit of the first elements of Biblical criticism. The infallibility of every "jot and tittle" of the Bible has been too often asserted by popular preachers, without the smallest comprehension of the suicidal nature of such a dogma in controversy with sceptics. The dogma is suicidal, because it makes the truth of Scripture to be involved in the discussion of every point, however immaterial in itself, on which Scripture may come into any collision, real or apparent, with the discoveries of modern days.

And although in some instances it may be possible for a commentator dexterously to evade such issues, and quietly to shirk many difficulties by keeping silence, yet such an artifice (unfortunately too common) is certain in the long run to tell against those who employ it, and to damage the truth itself.

We are not at all surprised that the *Speaker's Commentary*, though it has decided merits of its own, proved on the whole disappointing. The promise given in the prospectus that "the general reader" should be given "the same advantages as the scholar" could not be fulfilled. The qualifying clause which had been added in the prospectus, namely, "as far as possible," was forgotten by the public. The prospectus had raised hopes which were doomed to be deceptive.

The best portion of the *Speaker's Commentary* on the Pentateuch perhaps is that on the Book of *Genesis*. The author of those notes was Dr. Harold Browne, then Bishop of Ely, now Bishop of Winchester. The notes on the Book of *Exodus* are by Canon Cook and Rev. S. Clark. In that volume the notes on the earlier portion are superior to those on the later chapters. The notes on *Leviticus* are on the whole sadly defective. This is apparent when they are compared with the work of Dr. M. M. Kalisch on the same portion of Scripture, written from a decidedly "Rationalistic" point of view. The first volume of Kalisch's book on *Leviticus* appeared several years before the issue of the *Speaker's Commentary* on that book. Whatever qualifications Mr. Espin had for being selected as one of the annotators on *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, and *Joshua*, his colleague, the late Rev. J. F. Thrupp (though possessed of some merits as an expositor) was deficient in Hebrew scholarship, as his extraordinary translations of Ps. xlv. and lxviii. in his *Introduction to the Psalms* are alone amply sufficient to show.

The *Speaker's Commentary* on the Pentateuch ought not to be neglected by the general reader of the Bible. It has not, however, supplied the wants of the English student. It would greatly tend to the real advance of Pentateuchal studies, and materially assist the defence of the ancient Scriptures, if an impartial *résumé* were drawn up of the arguments adduced on both sides. The scholars on each side are too much disposed to ignore the arguments of the side opposed to their conclusions. The evil results of following such a plan are, however, more detrimental to the

defenders than to the assailants of Scripture. Among the commentaries on the entire Bible, issued somewhat earlier than the *Speaker's Commentary*, the *Critical, Experimental, and Practical Commentary*, published by W. Collins & Sons, of Glasgow (6 vols., 1862-1869), holds an honourable position. The Old Testament portion, in four vols., was edited by Rev. Robert Jamieson, D.D. (Genesis to Esther), and Rev. A. R. Faussett, M.A. (Job to Malachi). The New Testament was annotated by Rev. Principal David Brown and Rev. A. R. Faussett. But there is no advance here to be noted in the exposition of the Pentateuch.

Prior to the publication of the *Speaker's Commentary*. Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh, had already begun the issue of an English translation of Lange's *Bibelwerk*. The work begun in this country was ultimately taken up in the United States, and under the able editorship of Dr. Philip Schaff brought to a comparatively speedy conclusion. It was published simultaneously in New York and Edinburgh. Professor J. P. Lange had obtained the co-operation of a very competent staff of scholars, and his *Bibelwerk*, whether in German or English, will always retain a permanent value as a work of Biblical exegesis. But the plan of that work did not admit of the discussion of many subjects necessary for the full elucidation of the Pentateuch, and inasmuch as the work was primarily intended to be an assistance for clergymen in their pulpit preparations, the Biblical student will always complain of space allotted to the homiletical portion of the volumes. The critical notes added by the American scholars are often of value, but, in the portion which treats of the Pentateuch, the remarks of the late Professor Tayler Lewis (notwithstanding the respect due to his piety and general ability) require to be received with the greatest caution. However able, Professor Tayler Lewis is by no means a competent guide on points of Hebrew grammar or philology.

Not inferior in some respects to the *Speaker's Commentary*, and superior in several books of the Bible to that work, is the *Old Testament Commentary for English Readers, by Various Writers*, edited by the distinguished New Testament critic Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1882). The first volume contains commentaries on *Genesis* by Dr. R. Payne Smith, Dean of Canterbury; on *Exodus* by Rev. Professor Rawlinson; on *Leviticus* by Dr. C. D. Ginsburg; and on

Numbers by the late Rev. C. J. Elliott, Canon of Christ Church, Oxon. The second volume (issued in 1883) comprises the Books of *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua*, explained by Rev. C. H. Waller, M.A., now Principal of the London College of Divinity. The portions on *Genesis* and *Exodus* were executed by competent scholars, and afford much information of value to the student, but the notes are too brief, the introductions too curtailed to satisfy the student. The authors were cramped by the conditions under which their work had to be performed. The notes on the Book of Deuteronomy do not pretend even to grapple with the critical difficulties connected with that book. The writer confesses he had no time to consult modern commentaries. His great authority is the commentary of Rashi. The theories of Kuenen and Wellhausen are altogether ignored. The work, for aught it contains new, might have appeared fifty years ago. Some of the remarks are good and useful, but as a commentary on Deuteronomy the work is far behind the scholarship of the present day.

The *Pulpit Commentary*, edited by Rev. Canon Spence, M.A., and Rev. Joseph Exell, M.A., has realized much of what was expected from its prospectus. The weakness of that work, as in the case of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, lies in the enormous mass of homilies which accompany it, which far exceeds in bulk anything in Lange's *Bibelwerk*. The homiletics may occasionally be helpful to a preacher, but even for that purpose they are much overdone. The student is annoyed by the perpetual reiteration of the same thoughts in various forms, and often offended by the shallow dogmatism on questions of criticism displayed by the homilists. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind, much as one might wish that the clergy would dispense with such questionable assistance, that such "helps" are only too popular, and publishers eager for the wants of the public. It is to be regretted that the number of those who buy solid critical works is small in our country. The average Biblical student has to be treated with homœopathic doses of criticism, plentifully diluted with lighter matter. The critic with us has often to "dance in chains" along with the homilist. The partners may occasionally be well matched, and the "dance" may go off well, but in general the reverse is the case.

The Pentateuch occupies in the *Pulpit Commentary* five bulky volumes, and the Book of *Joshua* another volume of equal size.

The expositor of *Genesis* is Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M.A. The volume on *Genesis* appeared in 1881. Professor Rawlinson, who wrote the brief notes on *Exodus* for Bishop Ellicott's commentary, has in the *Pulpit Commentary* given a more detailed exposition of that book, which was published in 1882. In that year also the commentary on *Leviticus* was issued, which was mainly performed by Rev. F. Meyrick, M.A. Mr. Meyrick is a well-known scholar and voluminous writer. We cannot say we have examined his work with attention. But it does not augur well, looking from a student's standpoint, that while he cites H. Bonar as one of the commentators on the book, he has taken no notice of Kalisch's volumes, which ought to have been specially noticed and replied to, not to speak of numerous treatises by German scholars. The Book of *Numbers* is annotated by a clergyman of the Scotch Episcopal Church, Rev. R. Winterbotham, M.A., LL.B. That on *Deuteronomy* is by Rev. W. L. Alexander, D.D., who notices some of the views propounded by Wellhausen, and advocated in this country by Dr. W. Robertson Smith, now University Librarian at Cambridge. The volume on *Joshua* was mainly the work of Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A. It is unnecessary here to give the names of the homilists.

Homiletical commentaries seem to be at present the most popular in our country. For, independently of those already mentioned, a special *Homiletical Commentary* has also appeared under the competent editorship of Rev. J. S. Exell, published by Dickenson, London, 1855. The volumes we have seen are those on *Genesis* ch. i.-viii., by Rev. J. S. Exell; ch. ix.-l., by Rev. T. H. Leale, of King's College, London. The second volume, on *Exodus*, is by Rev. J. S. Exell; and a third, on *Numbers*, by Rev. T. Jones. These commentaries are also provided with a number of critical notes. The latter is a good sign, for it shows that, however backward we are yet in Old Testament literature, some progress has been made when compared with the general state of things twenty years ago. More homiletical and often highly suggestive are the volumes on the Pentateuch of the *People's Bible* by Rev. Joseph Parker, D.D. It would be impossible here to note all the books worth mentioning in this line.

The excellent series of handy commentaries published in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, edited by Dr. J. J. S. Perowne, Dean of Peterborough, does not yet include the books

of the Pentateuch. The commentary on *Genesis* for that series was to have been written by Dr. W. Robertson Smith, but his place has been taken by the Dean of Canterbury. Dr. C. D. Ginsburg has undertaken to supply the volumes on *Exodus*, *Numbers*, and *Deuteronomy*. The name of the writer on *Leviticus* has, as far as we know, not yet been announced.

Not inferior to the Cambridge series is the set of *Hendbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students*, published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh, which promises to embrace ultimately commentaries on the whole Bible. The only book of the Pentateuch which has as yet been commented on in the series is *The Book of Genesis, with Introduction and Notes*, by Marcus Dods, D.D. This little commentary is, for its size, most valuable. Its information is up to date, and its tone admirable. It is thoroughly reverential in spirit, but it does not ignore the fact of the composite origin of the Book of Genesis.

Dr. Cunningham Geikie's *Hours with the Bible, or The Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge*, is a sort of commentary on the Old Testament. The earlier volumes on the Pentateuch, which were published in 1882, contain a considerable amount of new information put before the public in a very readable form. The work appears to be creditably performed, though, as might be expected, it contains little original matter. The author's avowed object is to popularise the researches of others.

Dr. M. M. Kalisch commenced the issue in 1855 of what was intended to be a *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Translation*, by the publication of a *Commentary on Exodus*, with the Hebrew text and critical and explanatory notes. This, although not faultless, still remains the ablest English commentary on that book. The work is written in the main from the orthodox standpoint. In proof of this we may refer to the notes on the plagues of Egypt. The volume on the *Book of Genesis*, published in 1858, is also of considerable value. Dr. Kalisch in the latter volume inclines more towards views regarded in England as "Rationalistic"; but the work is by no means ultra, and contains a vast amount of information on all points bearing on the Book of Genesis. In the two subsequent volumes of his work, namely, those on the *Book of Leviticus*, Dr. Kalisch takes up definitely a position on the side represented by Renan, Strass, and Colenso. The first volume (published in 1867) contains a

remarkable essay on the *Sacrifices of the Hebrews and of other Nations*, which occupies more than 450 pp., while the second volume, published in 1872, contains equally important essays on the laws of diet, matrimony, the Jewish festivals and the Day of Atonement, the Monotheism of the Bible, etc. All these treatises, as well as the notes on *Leviticus*, are written from a "Rationalistic" point of view. No equally able work on such subjects has yet appeared on the orthodox side.

Dr. Kalisch's commentary was never finished. His *Bible Studies*, Part I., "The Prophecies of Balaam, or the Hebrew and the Heathen," were published in 1877. Part II. "The Book of Jonah, preceded by a Treatise on the Hebrew and the Stranger," published in 1878, brought to an end his Biblical labours. Whatever may be the opinion entertained as to his theological opinions, which resulted in an eclecticism set forth in his *Path and Goal: a Discussion on the Elements of Civilization and the Conditions of Happiness*,—which book contains a translation of the Book of Ecclesiastes, and was published in 1880—Dr. Kalisch did much by his works to promote the cause of Old Testament studies in this country. His death, which took place in 1885, removed from our midst one who was by no means "a dry, cold Rationalist," but a man of genial sympathy, as all who knew him even slightly, as the writer did, can willingly testify. His learning was unquestionable, his devotion to Biblical study intense. Would that we could point out equally productive scholars among the ranks of the orthodox! It is to be regretted that, with a few exceptions, orthodox English scholars have given themselves up to the production of small popular books on the Old Testament, rather than to the production of thoroughly critical and scientific works on Sacred Scripture. But in an army heavy dragoons are needed as well as light cavalry. The former cannot easily be extemporised when needed. So also scientific works are needed for the elucidation and defence of Scripture as well as popular hand-books, and we have too few of the former, inasmuch as they do not in general bring any profit to writers or publishers.

Thus far we have noticed only the leading general commentaries on the Old Testament. Our list is by no means exhaustive. We have yet to speak of the works published upon the individual books of the Pentateuch, of the numerous *Introductions*, and of monographs on subjects connected with such studies. Meanwhile

we venture to call the attention of scholars to the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Alt. u. Neuen Test.*, now being published in Germany under the editorship of Prof. Dr. H. L. Strack of Berlin, and Prof. Dr. Otto Zöckler of Greifswald, both eminently able and orthodox scholars. The volumes which have already appeared on *The Books of Samuel and Kings* with notes by Prof. Dr. A. Klostermann of Kiel, and on *Isaiah and Jeremiah*, by Prof. C. von Orelli of Basel, lead us to expect much from this series, more especially as the Books of *Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus* have been undertaken by Prof. Straack himself.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT.

(*To be continued.*)

BREVIA.

The Revolution in Tanner's Lane.—Some years ago we ventured to commend to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR two very remarkable books, *The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford* and *Mark Rutherford's Deliverance*. Since then an almost daily converse with the volumes has only served to deepen our sense of their great beauty and power and wisdom. It is with no common gratitude that we announce the appearance of a companion fit to stand with them, in *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*, recently published by Messrs. Trübner. It might be out of place here to comment on the extraordinary excellence of the author's style, or on the structural faults which mar the book as a mere story. Like his previous works, it has no message for the fortunate or the shallow, and they will pass it by. Its spell is that its writer has seen the true Gorgon head—and lived. For those who have been shaken to the centre by problems of time and eternity, it is a book to place with the dear and tried few that never fail to soothe and fortify the soul. “‘From the horns of the wild oxen’ that correction had often been precious to Zachariah. When at the point of being pinned to the ground—so he understood it—help had arisen; risen up from the earth, and might again arise.” This is the key-note of the book; it is written by one who has been often in the last extremity, “face to face with

the Red Sea," and has found deliverance. It is needless to say that the author is profoundly familiar with the Bible, its letter and its spirit. Here is how he makes one of his characters preach from it: "Jephthah had played for a great stake. Ought the Almighty—let us speak it with reverence—to have let him off with an ox, or even with a serf? I say that if we are to conquer Ammon we must pay for it, and we ought to pay for it. God elected Jephthah to that tremendous oath and that tremendous penalty. He elected him to the agony he endured while she was away upon the hills! That is God's election; an election to the cross, and to the cry, 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani.' 'Yes,' you will say, 'but He elected him to the victory over Ammon.' Doubtless He did; but what cared Jephthah for his victory when she came to meet him, or indeed for the rest of his life? What is a victory, what are triumphal arches and the praise of all creation, to a lonely man? Be sure, if God elects you, He elects you to suffering. Whom He loveth He chasteneth, and His stripes are not playwork. Ammon will not be conquered unless your heart be well nigh broken." Of the author's own attitude to Christianity much might be written, but it is needless. The wise will understand. He is at least of those *who ask their way to Zion with their faces thitherward.*

EDITOR.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE NOTE OF WARNING TO THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the New Testament writings which brings the new economy before us as a transfiguration of the old. In the Epistle of James the moral law delivered to Israel is translated into the “law of liberty” the “royal law.” In the First Epistle of Peter, the theocratic prerogatives of ancient Israel are handed down to the Church in a higher and abiding form. In the Revelation, we have the completed *history* of the kingdom of God, which was begun under the old covenant. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the whole system of ceremonial worship is transferred to the heavenlies, and invested with a spiritual and truly lifegiving significance.

In treating this Scripture, which is unique in its kind, we shall ask three questions, the answer to which will embrace all minor points demanding attention.

I. To what Churches was this letter addressed?
II. What was the object which the writer proposed to himself?

III. Who was the writer, who, unlike the authors of the other New Testament epistles, never gives his name?

I. The superscription of the letter describes those to whom it was sent as *Hebrews*. Is this superscription from the pen of the writer himself? or was it added by those who were the first to enrol this Scripture among the other

apostolic writings, out of which they were compiling the sacred library of their Church ? Obviously when we read such a heading as First Epistle to the Corinthians, we may be sure that it was not written by Paul himself. When he penned the first Epistle, he did not know that he should afterwards write a second ; and indeed in a letter like that, such a heading was unnecessary, since the opening words described those to whom it was addressed. It is otherwise with the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer enters at once upon his subject without any mention of names. Hence I am disposed to think that the superscription of the Epistle to the Hebrews is from the author's own pen. Weiss objects, that it was enough that the bearer of the letter knew its destination. This is true ; but it might fall into other hands, or in some way go astray.

Who then are these whom the writer describes as “the Hebrews” ? The word properly designates the members of the Jewish nation at large. It is so used in Philippians iii. 5. But it may have a more restricted meaning, as in Acts vi. 1, where, as used by the Christians of Jerusalem, it distinguishes the Hebrew-speaking Jews from the Hellenists, or Greek-speaking Jews of the same city. Neither of these meanings is admissible in the heading of the Epistle to the Hebrews, for the readers of this Epistle were certainly Christians and Greek-speaking Christians. It would be absurd to suppose such a letter addressed to Jews who were not Christians, or to Hebrew-speaking Jewish converts only. We must have recourse then to a third meaning. The reference here is to Judeo-Christian Churches generally. This is the sense in which the name occurs in the title “Gospel to the Hebrews,” given in the second century to the Gospel used by preference in the Judeo-Christian Churches. The heading of this Epistle therefore indicates that the writer is addressing himself to certain Churches of Jewish origin.

But it may be asked whether, in thus expressing himself, he has reference to Judeo-Christians at large, or to one or more Churches in particular, coming within this category? The former supposition has been supported by many theologians, ancient and modern. M. Reuss maintains that in this Epistle we have a theological treatise intended for the whole Church. Hofmann describes it as a sermon in the form of a letter. This theory however fails to explain a number of passages in the course of the Epistle, which clearly indicate that the writer had in view one particular Church, or more than one. For instance, in chap. v. 11, 12, he reproaches his readers with being slow to apprehend Christian truth, though they had been so long converted. Again, in chap. x. 34, he praises them for their sympathy with the sufferings of those who were in bonds (the true reading *τοῖς δεσμοῖσι*), that is, certain prisoners known to them and to him, and for the readiness of their self-sacrifice on their behalf. Again, in chap. xiii. 7, he speaks of the death of their leaders, whose faith they should imitate. These passages are quite in harmony with the conclusion of the Epistle, which is of an epistolary character, and the genuineness of which has been gratuitously called in question. The writer is so evidently addressing himself to particular readers, that he speaks of coming shortly with Timothy to visit them.

Where then are we to look for these Christians of Jewish origin to whom this epistle is addressed? For the last century, criticism has been making exhaustive attempts to answer this question. The whole world has been scoured to find the readers of this Epistle. Some say they are to be found in Cyprus; others, in Asia Minor (Lycaonia, Galatia, Phrygia, Ephesus); others again, in Greece (Thessalonica, Corinth); yet others, in Spain. The hypotheses in support of which reasons more or less solid have been advanced, are the following: Antioch (Hofmann); Alex-

andria (Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Bunsen, and more particularly Wieseler); Rome, according to the theory now most commonly received (Holtzmann, Kurtz, Renan, Harnack, von Soden); lastly, the traditional view, strongly vindicated by Weiss, regards the Churches of Palestine as those referred to by the writer.

The *prima facie* argument in favour of this opinion is that there is not the slightest allusion in the whole course of the Epistle to the presence of any section of Christians of Gentile origin among the readers. Now there were no purely Judeo-Christian Churches except in Palestine and in those regions of the East where dwelt those "myriads of Jews who had believed," as James says (Acts xxi. 20). It was to these same Churches, it would appear, that James himself addressed his Epistle (Jas. i. 1). It is further manifest, from the tenor of the whole Epistle, that it appeals to men who were hindered in their spiritual progress by such an obstinate attachment to the worship of the visible sanctuary, as was in danger of leading them to renounce the gospel. Such an attitude of mind is conceivable only among persons living in proximity to the Temple of Jerusalem, where the old worship was still celebrated. This hypothesis is supported by chap. v. 12, where the readers are spoken of as converts of long standing; and by chap. ii. 3, where we see that they had been brought into the faith by those who had themselves heard the Lord. Lastly, the reference in chap. xiii. 7 to the glorious death of the leaders of the flock agrees perfectly with that which Josephus tells us (*Ant.* xx. 9. § 1) of the judicial murder of James and other chief men of the Church in Jerusalem, which took place in the year 62, under the high priest Ananus. Thus the position taken up on this question by the early Church, which is stated by Clement of Alexandria, and upheld among critics by Hug, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Thiersch, Delitzsch, Riehm, and Weiss, appears to us,

after all that has been advanced to the contrary, unassailable. It is also, as we have seen, the only explanation which bears out the meaning of the title, "Epistle to the Hebrews."

What considerations then, we ask, have led so many writers to seek another solution? In the Epistle itself there is, as it seems to me, only one passage which presents any difficulty from the traditional point of view. This occurs in chap. vi. 10, where the writer commends his readers for the love they have shown and are still showing in ministering to the saints. If these words refer to collections made on behalf of suffering Christians, they would seem to have no application to the Church of Jerusalem, which was itself in deep poverty, and on behalf of which other Churches made contributions. But the writer may have in view the many Churches scattered over Judea, rather than the Church in the capital. Even in that Church there certainly were some rich persons who could, if it were needful, minister to their poor brethren. The expression which Paul uses (Rom. xv. 26), that the "contribution is for the poor *among* the saints that are at Jerusalem," clearly distinguishes the poor from the whole body of the faithful. According to 2 Corinthians viii. 2, the Christians of Macedonia were in deep poverty, and yet, as the Apostle says, "the abundance of their joy abounded unto the riches of their liberality." Why might it not have been the same in the Church of Jerusalem, even the poor contributing to the help of those who were yet poorer and suffering persecution, like those of whom James speaks in his Epistle?

In favour of the hypothesis that the Epistle was addressed to the Church in Egypt, stress is laid on the Alexandrine style of the writer, a certain correspondence of ideas with Philo, and, lastly, the many quotations from the Septuagint. This, if well founded at all, is an argu-

ment for the Alexandrine origin, not of the readers, but of the writer. As however he says, in chap. xiii. 19, "that I may be *restored* to you the sooner," there seems reason to suppose that he belonged originally to the Church to which he was writing. In weighing these arguments in favour of Alexandria however, we must bear in mind that Alexandrine culture was diffused more or less among all oriental Jews. In Acts vi. 9 we read of a synagogue of the Alexandrines at Jerusalem. There can be no doubt that in the worship of this synagogue, the Septuagint version of the Old Testament would be read; and Alexandrine ideas, and even those of Philo, may easily have found their way into the Judaism of Palestine. The objections which occur to me to the theory that this Epistle was addressed to Alexandria are, first, that that Church was far from being purely Judeo-Christian; and, second, that the Alexandrine teachers (Clement and Origen) never hint that their Church had any such claim.¹

The opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to the Judeo-Christian portion of the Church in Rome found at one time great acceptance. This was at the time when critics were inclined to think that the Roman Church contained a largely preponderating Judeo-Christian element. That time is past, and the only pretext for the idea just referred to is found in the words (chap. xiii. 24), "They of Italy salute you." At one time great importance was attached to these words, as showing that the Epistle was written from Italy. Now, those who advocate the theory that the letter was addressed to the Church of Rome, adduce the same words in support of their hypo-

¹ Wieseler, in his zealous advocacy of this view, brings forward the fact that a temple was built at Leontopolis in Egypt, to serve as a visible sanctuary for the Israelites of that region. This temple however never attained any importance, and the writer could not compare it to the Temple of Jerusalem, as on this theory he would be doing throughout the Epistle. This idea is now abandoned.

thesis. How can this be? Those whose salutation the Apostle conveys are supposed to be Christians from Italy, who had taken refuge in the place from which the Epistle was written. They make the writer the medium of their greetings to their fellow countrymen. But if this were the case, why does he not add a salutation from the Church in the midst of which he finds himself with these Italian refugees? Again, does it seem probable that any Church of Italy (whether of Rome, according to Holtzmann, or of Ravenna, according to Ewald)—should have been so strongly tempted to fall back into Judaism, as those seem to have been for whom this Epistle was intended? The argument drawn from the passage quoted has nothing solid to rest upon. It has not been observed that the preposition *ἀπό* (of) stands in connexion here, as in many other places, both with the pronoun *οἱ* (they) and the verb *ἀσπάξεσθαι* (salute you). “They of Italy salute you from Italy”; as in Acts x. 23, where the *ἀπό* (“from Joppa”) refers both to the subject, the brethren, and to the verb, “went with him”; or again, in Acts xvii. 13, where the same preposition *ἀπό* stands in connexion both with the pronoun *they* and the verb “should come.” This construction occurs also in classic Greek, as in the *Anabasis* (v. 2, 24): “When that house fell, those from the houses fled also (from those houses),”¹ where the *ἀπό* refers undoubtedly both to the verb *fled* and the subject *they*.

It follows then that this letter was certainly written from Italy, from one of the Churches associated with those of Judaea. I do not say from Rome, though this supposition would naturally suggest itself; but as, according to chap. xiii. 23, Timothy, who had been just released from prison, probably in Rome, was coming to join the author in the place from which he was writing, it is presumable that he was not in Rome.

¹ ἐφευγον καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν οἰκιῶν.

II. What was the religious state of those to whom the Epistle was written? and what was the purpose of the writer? These questions can only be answered by a rapid review of the contents of the letter.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is properly a treatise consisting of two parts—one didactic (chap. i.—x.), the other practical (xi.—xiii.). It concludes with a short epistolary appendix (xiii. 22—25). In this respect it resembles the Epistle to the Romans, with this difference, that there we have an epistolary preamble, which is altogether wanting in the Epistle before us. It has been conjectured that there may have been such a preamble originally, but that it was suppressed when the Epistle was placed among the canonical Scriptures. But such a liberty would scarcely have been taken with a writing which was to have the honour of being enrolled among the apostolic Scriptures preserved by the Church.

THE DIDACTIC SECTION OF THE EPISTLE.

The first two chapters are seen at a glance to form a section by themselves in this grand argument. They contain a comparison of Jesus, the Messiah, with the angels. He is first shown to be higher than they by His Divine nature; and, next, to be made a little lower than the angels by His incarnation and death. This very humiliation however gives Him a higher fitness for His work as a Saviour.

The superiority of Messiah to the angels is demonstrated in chap. i. by a series of passages from the Old Testament, some of which are applied in the original context to Jehovah Himself. Hence it is evident that the writer regarded the person of Messiah as nothing less than the supreme manifestation of Jehovah. This didactic statement is immediately followed by a short practical application (chap. ii. 1—4). If every act of disobedience to

the law of Moses, which was given by angels, had been severely punished, how much heavier must be the guilt of neglecting the salvation brought by the Son of God!

With chap. ii. 5 commences the second section, showing forth the state of humiliation by which Messiah had been made a little lower than the angels. The perfect world for which we are looking had been made subject by prophecy, not to an angel, but to One who for a little while was made lower than the angels (Ps. viii. 5). Jesus was such an One. He stooped below the angels, and made Himself one with us for the suffering of death. But He did this, that He might bring many sons unto glory, and might become the faithful Intercessor for all those who were subject to temptations such as He Himself had known by experience.

A short exhortation (chap. iii. 1) gives the practical application of this second section. "Let us consider this Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus." Happily the truth here brought out is quite independent of the application made by the writer of the passage from Psalm viii.; for that application rests, not upon the real sense of the Hebrew text, but upon the Septuagint version, which is now known to be inexact.

It may be asked, What led the writer to open his argument with this comparison between Jesus and the angels? It must be remembered that, from a Jewish point of view (chap. ii. 2, Gal. iii. 20), the law, the distinguishing privilege of Israel, had been given through the medium of angels. This then was the highest theocratic authority, next to God Himself; and the writer would now show the inferiority even of the angelic hierarchy to Jesus.

This is made clear by the section which follows (chaps. iii., iv.). The writer compares Jesus to the two greatest personages in Jewish history—Moses and Joshua. This section also is divided into two parts: in the first (chap.

iii.), we have the comparison between Jesus and Moses; in the second (chap. iv.), that between Jesus and Joshua. Each of these divisions, like the foregoing, consists first of a didactic statement, and then of a solemn warning.

Just as the master builder is greater than the man who builds the house, so Jesus is greater than Moses (*vv. 2-6*). The long practical application which follows may be thus summed up. If the Jews in the wilderness were punished for their unbelief of Moses by not being allowed to enter Canaan, how much more certainly will those who let go their faith in Jesus be shut out from the rest of God!

This introduces the second section, the comparison with Joshua (chap. iv. 1-10). How can the writer speak of the shutting out of the Jews of his time from the promised rest, when from the time of Joshua they had been in actual possession of the land of Canaan? The answer is given in the words of Psalm xcv. 11, which show that the Canaan into which Joshua led the tribes was not the true rest of God. Jesus alone leads His people into this true rest. Hence a solemn charge to hold fast their profession of faith in Jesus the Son of God, who is passed into the heavens (chap. iv. 11-16).

After comparing Jesus with the angels, and with Moses and Joshua, the lawgiver and leaders of Israel, there remained yet a third comparison to be drawn. This occupies the third section, in which the writer establishes a parallel between Jesus and Aaron the high priest. The priesthood constituted, with the law and the possession of Canaan, the third great theocratic privilege of the chosen people (chaps. v.-x.).

This third section, like the others, consists of two parts. The first is a comparison of the ministry of Jesus with that of Aaron in its nature and origin (chaps. v.-vii.); the second, a comparison of the two priesthoods as to their efficacy (chaps. viii.-x.).

In comparing the nature of the two priesthoods, the writer treats first of their equality (chap. v.), and next of the superiority of the priesthood of Jesus (chaps. vi., vii.).

Their equality is demonstrated by four characteristics which they have in common. These are as follows: 1st, Aaron was taken from among men to be their representative before God. 2nd, He was compassed with infirmity, that he might feel for the infirmities of his brethren. 3rd, He offered a sacrifice for himself, and not for the people only. 4th, He was directly called of God to his office.

We can but wonder at the boldness with which the writer applies these four characteristics to Jesus, especially the third. He is here alluding to the scene in Gethsemane, in which he sees the sacrifice offered by Jesus for Himself, before bearing our sins on the cross. In the agony in the garden, He consummated the voluntary offering up of His own human nature, that by this perfect obedience He might become the sacrifice for all mankind. Jesus is equal to Aaron on these four points, hence He is truly a high priest. But the writer is leading up to a far higher point. He will show that Jesus is the perfect High Priest, and in order to this, he must show that His priesthood is higher in its nature than that of Aaron.

Before entering on this subject however he gives a long preamble (chaps. v. 10–vi. 20), in which he complains of the want of spiritual insight in his readers. He reminds them of the awful truth that if any one fall away after receiving the grace of regeneration and spiritual enlightenment, no further renovation is possible. He does indeed afterwards express the hope that such may not be the sad lot of any of his readers, but that they will hold fast even to the end, knowing that their hope of salvation rests, not only upon the promise, but upon the very oath of God.

After this introduction he takes up again the argument commenced in chap. v. 10, and proceeds to show how the

priesthood of Jesus is higher than that of Aaron. He finds in the history of the patriarchs a point of comparison which, read in the light of some words of David, supplies the elements he needs for his argument. The point thus taken up is the history of Melchisedec (Gen. xiii.) in connexion with Psalm cx. 4, in which David, addressing the future Messiah, hails Him as the “priest after the order of Melchisedec.”

The outline of the argument is this : Christ is equal to Melchisedec ; Melchisedec is higher than Aaron : hence Christ is higher than Aaron (vii. 1-23).

The first of these propositions is proved by the fact that Abraham paid the tenth of the spoil which he had taken in war to “Melchisedec, king of Salem and priest of God Most High.” Now the payment of tithe is a tribute paid by the lower to the higher. Hence Abraham, and in him Levi and Aaron himself, were declared to be of a lower order than Melchisedec (vii. 1-10).

The second proposition is proved by the fact that Jesus does not come of the tribe of Levi, which was the priestly tribe, according to Moses, but that like Melchisedec *king of Salem*, he was descended from the royal tribe of Judah, deriving, like Melchisedec, his priestly right not from human descent, but from the power of an endless life within Him (vii. 11-16).

From this fundamental analogy, which shows the identity of nature between Christ and Melchisedec, a third proposition follows. The priesthood of Christ, being equal to that of Melchisedec, which is higher than that of Aaron, is itself higher than that of Aaron.

This the writer proceeds to confirm by a few particular points of superiority. 1st, The oath of God, which, according to Psalm cx. 4, inaugurated the messianic priesthood—an honour not conferred on the priesthood of Aaron. 2nd, The permanence of the priesthood of Christ (noticed also in

Psalm ex.), while the sons of Aaron die one after another. 3rd, The one completed sacrifice of Christ for Himself and for the people, while in the Jewish temple fresh victims needed to be offered day by day. Lastly (4th), The spotless character of Christ, "the Son perfected for evermore," in contrast to the human infirmity of the descendants of Aaron (*vv. 17-23*).

But of what avail to us would be this superiority of the priesthood of Christ, in its nature and origin, to that of Aaron, unless it were also more efficacious in our behalf? This forms the theme of the third section of the Epistle, and is the key-note to the whole didactic portion (chaps. viii.-x.).

Its treatment is introduced by the analysis of a passage in the prophecies of Jeremiah (xxx. 31 and following), which foretells the substitution of a new covenant for the covenant of Sinai, which could bring nothing to perfection. The writer proceeds to set forth the superiority of this new covenant, showing how the sacrifice on which it is based is more efficacious than that of Aaron, on which the old covenant rested.

1. As to the place where the sacrifice is offered—the first, an earthly sanctuary; the second, heaven itself (chap. ix. 1-5).

2. As to the manner of the priest's entrance into the holy place—under the old covenant, *once in the year*; under the new, *once for all* (*vv. 6-11*).

3. As to the victims offered—under the old covenant, "the blood of goats and of calves"; under the new, Christ "offered Himself without blemish unto God" (*vv. 12-24*).

4. As to the offering of sacrifices—under the old covenant, the constant repetition of the same sacrifices proved their inadequacy; under the new, "the sacrifice once offered perfects for ever them that are sanctified" (*v. 25-x. 18*).

This central passage closes, like the rest, with a practical application. It is an invitation to enter at once, through the blood of Jesus, into the holiest of all (intimate communion with God), access to which was closed under the old covenant, but is now open to the followers of Christ by a new and living way. Then follows another solemn warning. “Beware of forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, lest you forsake also your faith itself; for there would remain no more sacrifice for the expiation of such a sin” (*vv. 16–20*). Thus repeatedly does the writer hold up before his readers the danger of falling away, with its awful consequences.

THE PRACTICAL PART OF THE EPISTLE.

The general application, contained in chaps. xi.–xiii., is to the didactic portion, as a whole, what each particular parenthesis was to its didactic premisses.

If we remember the tenacity with which the Churches addressed appear to have clung to the visible sanctuary at Jerusalem, and the value which they attached to the maintenance of their oneness with the chosen nation settled in the land of Canaan, we shall easily understand the scope of the writer’s observations in chap. xi., in which he held before them the picture of the life of faith and endurance led by the patriarchs and prophets. All these, each in his own manner, let go the seen that they might grasp the unseen. This is the very essence of faith according to *v. 1*, which is, as it were, the text of the whole chapter.

In chap. xii. the writer adds to the duty of faith the duty of patience. Keeping the eye fixed upon Jesus, who was the first to mark out clearly the track of faith, and the first to reach its goal, the believers are to accept without dismay the sufferings by which God is educating them as His children, and are to strive after holiness; for they are already

citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, and are already realising the efficacy of the blood which speaketh better things than that of Abel. Let them fear then to turn away from Him who speaketh to them from heaven, "for our God is a consuming fire." Lastly, to the two duties of faith and steadfast patience he adds, in chap. xiii., that of utter self-renunciation. He had long been leading up to this. It is indeed the gist of the whole Epistle. At length (chap. xiii. 13) he speaks out, and demands the supreme act of sacrifice. "Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." As Jesus was led forth in ignominy outside the walls of Jerusalem, bearing His cross, so the time is come for those believing Jews who have cherished till now the bond of oneness with the Jewish nation and religion to make the great surrender, and break with a bond which threatens to lead them to their ruin. "Break loose from Judaism. Be wholly His who is better to you than the angels, better than Moses or Joshua, better than Aaron and his priesthood. Be all for Jesus, in whom you possess the eternal reality of all the good things of which Judaism offers you only the shadow."

Such, as it seems to me, is the thought brought out in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer only adds in conclusion a sort of epistolary postscript. He excuses himself for having written such a letter of exhortation to such readers. He speaks of his approaching visit with Timothy, who has lately been set at liberty. Then he greets the heads of the flock in his own name and that of the Christians of Italy, and desires that grace may be with them all.

What was the spiritual need which this Epistle was intended to meet? There can be but one answer. These Christians of Jewish origin were on the point of reverting to Judaism, from which they had never more than half broken loose. It is this falling back to the things behind,

against which the writer of the Epistle would fain put them on their guard. It is at this he is aiming in all the practical exhortations to which each separate didactic period leads up. A critical time had come for the Churches in Judæa, especially for the Church in Jerusalem. The general cause of the danger is easy to define. It was the overweening attachment of these Judeo-Christians to outward rites and ceremonial worship. This ceremonialism had been a real hindrance to the development of spiritual life in these Christians, the firstfruits of the gospel; and, as the writer of the Epistle points out reproachfully, they had become spiritually “dull of hearing.” And when “by reason of the time, they ought to be teachers, had need to be taught again the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God” (chap. v. 11, 12).

Beside this general cause of a stunted Christian life, there were also particular circumstances which added to the gravity of the position. There was the impending war with the Roman power, which placed the Christians in a strait between their faith and their patriotism. There was also the rapidly advancing work of Paul among the Gentile nations, which, tending as it did to minimise the obligations of the ceremonial law, was a constant source of irritation to those who still clung to Mosaic institutions (see Acts xxi. 19–25).

Thiersch argues that after Paul’s last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xx.), the believing Jews were excluded from the temple, into which James alone was still permitted to enter (according to Hegesippus), and that this deprivation of the worship to which they had been accustomed from childhood greatly discouraged them and inclined them to go back to Judaism. It must be borne in mind also, that this was about the time of the departure of the apostles, and of the death of James and other leaders of the flock, who had succeeded to the apostolic charge. There is also one

other circumstance to be taken into account, on which de Wette rightly lays stress: namely, the twofold disappointment caused, first, by the persistent refusal of the Jewish people to accept Jesus as the Messiah (whereas the Christians had always been looking for their conversion); and, second, by the prolonged delay of the return of Christ, for which they had looked as immediate. If we put all these things together, we shall easily comprehend the distress of mind that took possession of the Judeo-Christians in the years 65, 66, at which time it seems to us probable this Epistle was written.

This date is confirmed by the passage in which the writer speaks of the liberation of Timothy, and of his approaching arrival with himself. Timothy had no doubt repaired to Rome at the summons of Paul in his second captivity (2 Tim. iv. 19). He had then been imprisoned with Paul, and after Paul's martyrdom had been set at liberty. This seems the natural explanation of chap. xiii. 23, and fixes the date of the Epistle as approximately A.D. 66. Some critics assign to it a date after the fall of Jerusalem. Zahn gives the year 80; Holtzmann, Harnack, von Soden date it under Domitian, between 80 and 96; others about the year 100, or a little later. It is no argument against these opinions, to say that the present tense of the verb is used in speaking of the worship of the sanctuary, for we still use to-day in referring to the Mosaic institutions, such expressions as "the sacrifice is offered morning and evening." But Hilgenfeld rightly asks, How could the writer have said, "Now if Jesus were on earth, He would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law," if he had been writing at a time when no sacrifice could any longer be offered? Or how could he have said, "In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old: but that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto

vanishing away" (chap. viii. 13), if the worship of the old covenant had already ceased? Or how could he have expressed himself thus, "Else would they not have ceased to be offered," if they had actually already ceased to be offered? Hilgenfeld concludes from these considerations that the Epistle was written between the years 64 and 66. The writer would certainly not have taken so much trouble to prove the insufficiency of that which no longer existed. If God had already sealed the doom of the old worship, no argument was needed on the part of man; he had only to appeal to this decisive judgment.

The deep earnestness of this Epistle, its solemn warnings, threats, and exhortations, are only to be explained by the presence of a very real danger; namely, that tendency to falling away from the faith which we have described above.

III. Who was the writer?

The opinion which has become traditional and general in the Church since the close of the fourth century, and which assigns the authorship of this Epistle to St. Paul, had been accepted in the East long before that time. It was promulgated by the Alexandrine doctors, Pantenus, Clement, Origen. But until the close of the fourth century it had not been received in the West by Irenaeus, or by the author of the *Fragment of Muratori*, or by Tertullian, Hippolytus, or Cyprian. Jerome testifies to this difference of opinion between the two great sections of the Church, up to the time when the question was resolved in the Synod of Carthage, in 397, in favour of the apostolic authorship. This decision was arrived at under the influence of Augustine, who had himself yielded on this point to the Eastern tradition.

The Alexandrine doctors did not however disguise from themselves the difficulties which stood in the way of their view. Pantenus admitted that the Apostle acted in a

way quite contrary to his custom, in not mentioning his own name at the beginning of the letter. He explained this omission as arising from the modesty of Paul, who was unwilling to style himself an Apostle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as Jesus Himself was their Apostle (chap. iii. 1). Clement recognises that there is a great difference between the style of this Epistle and the other Epistles of Paul ; but he explains it on the theory that Paul wrote the original in Aramaic, and that it was translated into Greek by Luke. Origen says that any one competent to judge of differences of style will observe that this Epistle is far more Greek in its form than the other writings of the Apostle ; but, on the other hand, the thoughts are admirable and on a par with those which abound in the Epistles of Paul. The substance of the Epistle then is of Paul ; as to the writer of it in its present form, God only knows who he is. Tradition, he says, points either to Clement, who became Bishop of Rome, or to Luke, the writer of the Gospel and of the Acts.

Criticism, after being long repressed by the decisions of the Council of Carthage, reasserted itself at the time of the Reformation. Erasmus attributed the Epistle to the Roman Clement ; Luther conceived the idea that Apollos was its author. Calvin pronounced in favour of Luke. The Council of Trent confirmed the old traditional opinion, which was accepted in the Lutheran Church till the middle of the 18th century, when rationalism lifted up its voice. From the time of Semler appeared a succession of writings for and against the authorship of Paul, until between 1826 and 1840 Bleek published his great work, which decisively turned the scale against the old received opinion. At the present day Hofmann is the only theologian of any weight who maintains the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Ebrard and Döllinger are in favour of Luke ; Riethmaier

and Bisping, two Catholic divines, support Clement of Rome; Semler, de Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, Kurtz, Farrar, De Pressensé, Hilgenfeld, hold that the author is Apollos (following in this Tertullian, whose testimony we shall presently quote); Ullmann, Wieseler, Ritschl, Grau, Thiersch, Weiss, Renan, Zahn, Keil, conclude in favour of Barnabas; Mynster and Böhme support Silas; lastly, Ewald, Grimm, Lipsius, von Soden, attribute the Epistle to some Alexandrine Christian of name unknown. Reuss hesitates between Apollos and Barnabas.

In favour of the authorship of Paul, Origen insists on the beauty of the thoughts; but surely there were many men in the primitive Church whose thoughts were admirable. Another point urged is the exact agreement of the quotation given in chap. x. 30 with that of Paul (Rom. xii. 19), which does not tally verbally with Deuteronomy xxxii. 35, 36, either in the Hebrew or Septuagint version. This is no doubt a point difficult to explain. But if the letter was written from Italy, the writer might have read in Rome the Epistle to the Romans, and quoted from memory the words as given by Paul. In any case, such a point of detail is not sufficient to outweigh the much graver arguments against the apostolic authorship.

In the first place, we note the *order* of the Epistle—the absence of any heading or introductory thanksgiving, and the recurrence of short parentheses at the close of each didactic portion. All this is quite foreign to the manner of Paul. The style also is markedly different from that of Paul. Here we have rounded, oratorical periods, while Paul's phraseology is unstudied, broken, abrupt. Hofmann explains this difference by saying that Paul, released from prison, and awaiting at Brindisi the arrival of Timothy, had ample leisure to give attention to style in a way he had never done before. It is strange indeed that he should have written in polished Greek to the Hebrews, while all his

life he had been writing to the Hellenes in a style abounding with rugged and barbarous Hebraisms. With regard to the vocabulary of this Epistle, as compared with that of Paul's letters, we commend to our readers' study Prof. Gardiner's work, *The Language of the Epistle to the Hebrews as Bearing upon its Authorship*. We know no other work on the subject to compare with this, either for solidity or for the delicacy with which points of comparison are treated. Prof. Gardiner himself was constrained to change his opinion as to the origin of the Epistle, so cogent and unexpected were the results of his researches (p. 19). In the citations from the Old Testament, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews servilely copies the Septuagint, even when the translation is inexact. Paul, on the contrary, often corrects the Septuagint by the Hebrew. Again the writer cites from the text of Codex Alexandrinus, Paul from the Codex Vaticanus. The writer further reproduces long passages, which must have been copied; Paul uses only short quotations, generally made, as far as we can judge, from memory. The writer of this Epistle quotes with such introductory formulas as "God saith," "the Holy Spirit thus testifying," etc. Paul either mentions the sacred writer from whom he quotes, or makes no allusion to his authority.

The difference is very marked, further, from a *religious point of view*. We cannot here go into the question whether the author was writing on the basis of Pauline teaching, modified by Alexandrine influence, or whether he was simply working out the primitive apostolic teaching under Pauline influence. But one point seems to us perfectly clear. According to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the redemptive work of Christ is carried on rather in the heavenly sanctuary, as the outcome of the resurrection and ascension of the Lord; while in the teaching of Paul it centres in the cross. This is not a contradiction,

for that which the Redeemer presents in the most holy place in the heavens is the blood shed upon the cross ; and in the teaching of Paul himself, the cross of Christ only saves us as it leads on to His resurrection and intercession in the heavens. Still the same truth is regarded from two very distinct points of view.¹

We draw attention, in conclusion, to one passage, which could never have been written by St. Paul, the passage, namely, in which he says that he was taught the Gospel by those who had heard it from the mouth of the Lord (chap. ii. 3). Paul, when speaking of himself, categorically denies any such attitude of dependence on the other apostles of the Lord (Gal. i. 11-17).

Dr. Biesenthal² has reproduced in our day the theory first invented by Clement of Alexandria, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul in Aramaic, and translated by Luke into Greek. In the translation however he is supposed to have fallen into a number of errors, as Dr. Biesenthal proves by himself re-translating the Epistle from Greek into Hebrew. But how many times has it been shown that the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be a translation ? It abounds in compound words which are essentially Greek, and have no analogues in Aramaic or in Hebrew, and it contains plays upon words such as could only occur in a composition originally Greek.³ Can the writer of this original composition be St. Luke ? The Christology of the third Gospel presents indeed some analogy with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews (as, for instance, the growth of Jesus in knowledge and obedience) ; and that which is said (chap. xiii. 23) of the personal relations of the author with Timothy might well apply to Luke. But could

¹ The difference in the conception of faith, which has often been remarked, seems to me easily resolved if we look at Rom. iv. 20, 2 Cor. v. 7.

² *Das Trost-schreiben des Ap. Paulus an die Hebräer.* 1878.

³ Ἐμαθεν—ἐπαθεν ; μένονταν—μελλονταν ; διαθήκη (covenant and testament), Comp. v. 8 ; xiii. 14 ; ix. 15-26.

a Gentile Christian, a disciple of Paul, ask the Churches of Judea to pray for him “that he might be restored to them the sooner” (chap. xiii. 19)? The style of Luke’s writing moreover is clear and flowing, but not at all oratorical.

Could the writer be Clement of Rome? But he has no originality of thought or brilliancy of style. It is enough to read a few lines of his Epistle to the Corinthians, to be struck with the difference between that and the Epistle before us. Clement imitates the Epistle to the Hebrews, but he is only a copyist.

Can the writer be Apollos? But how could this young Christian, a catechumen of Priscilla and Aquila, two disciples of Paul, say that he learned the gospel from those who had themselves heard the Lord? How could such a one have the boldness to write such a letter to the Churches of Judea, the oldest and most venerable Churches of Christendom? How, lastly, could he speak of being restored to them, from whom he had never come out, and to whom he had never belonged?¹

We come now to the man who commands to-day the majority of votes—Barnabas. He was certainly one of the members of the primitive Church of Jerusalem, and one of its most eminent members, a disciple of the apostles, and almost their equal (Acts iv. 36, 37). He was moreover by birth a Levite, and consequently familiar from childhood with all the traditions of the temple worship. He was a Hellenist Jew from Cyprus, and competent as such to write in excellent Greek. We seem almost to read his very signature in the epilogue of the Epistle when he says (chap. xiii. 22), “Bear with the word of exhortation” ($\tauοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως$), reminding us of the name which the Apostles had given him (Acts iv. 36), “son of exhortation” ($\tauοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως$). The fact moreover that in the East an

¹ As to the Alexandrinisms of the Epistle to the Hebrews, see Prof. Gardiner, p. 21.

epistle was ascribed to him, of which he was certainly not the author, seems to prove that some genuine letter from his pen had existed. Lastly (and this is important), Barnabas is the only one of all the reputed authors in favour of whom a positive tradition can be shown; for it is of the Epistle to the Hebrews Tertullian is speaking when he says: “There exists also a writing entitled *To the Hebrews*, by Barnabas, a man sufficiently authorised of God.”¹ One grave difficulty seems to me however to counterbalance all the arguments just brought forward. How is it possible that a well-known and all but apostolic name, like that of Barnabas, should have been almost completely lost? And is not the fact that another writing was falsely assigned to Barnabas, an added argument against the suppression of his name in an Epistle really written by him?

We cannot help asking if a less illustrious name would not solve the problem more easily? May not the writer have been Silas—himself also an eminent member of the primitive Church of Jerusalem, and even a prophet in that Church (Acts xv. 32); who was also honoured by being made a delegate from the apostles to the Churches of Syria, who succeeded Barnabas as fellow labourer with Paul on his missionary journey, and assisted him in forming the Churches of Greece; who was subsequently associated with the work of Peter (1 Pet. v. 12), and as one of the founders of the Churches in Greece, must have come much into contact with Timothy (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19)? This gives the key to the relations between the writer and Timothy implied in Hebrews xiii. 23, “with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.” Silas was with Paul during nearly two years of his ministry in Corinth, and this accounts for the apostolic character of the teaching which many modern critics have observed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer had come largely under the

¹ *De Pudicitia*, c. 20.

influence of Paul. If we compare 1 Corinthians iii. 2, "I fed you with milk, not with meat," with Hebrews v. 12-14, "Ye are become such as have need of milk, not of strong meat . . ."; or again, 1 Corinthians x. 1-11 with Hebrews iii. 12-19—can we not clearly catch the echo of the teachings to which the writer had listened from the lips of Paul at Corinth? Lastly, as the companion of the Apostle Peter towards the close of his career, Silas may have gone with him to Rome; which would explain how he was able to tell the Judean Christians of the liberation of Timothy and of his approaching departure from Italy, adding the promise that he would visit them with him.

Whatever conclusion may be arrived at from a consideration of all these various theories, we are glad to close this study of the Epistle with the words of Thiersch: "If it should be found that a noble picture, which had been attributed to Raphael, was not by that artist, there would not be one masterpiece the less, but one great master the more."

To us it seems certain that the admirable Epistle we have been studying is not from the pen of Paul; but this very fact only serves to reveal to us the abundance and excellence of the spiritual gifts possessed by men who occupied only the second rank in the apostolic Church. Whether they were named Barnabas or Apollos, Aquila or Silas, these stars of the second magnitude were able to send forth far-reaching rays of light; and we recognise the fitness of the title *prophets* applied to some of them, "first apostles, then prophets" (1 Cor. xii. 28). Though the Epistle to the Hebrews is not of apostolic origin, it is none the less a prophetic scripture, a true document of revelation.¹

F. GODET.

¹ Different opinions prevail as to the epistolary supplement (chap. xiii. 22-25) and its relation to the rest of the letter. Delitzsch attributes these four verses

HISTORY OF THE WORD "ETERNAL."

THEOLOGICAL controversy first awakened English attention to the distinction between *eternal* and *everlasting*; and the almost entire displacement of *everlasting* from the revised version of the New Testament excited some murmurs on doctrinal grounds; but the revisers had clearly no option: they found two distinct words, *aīðios* and *aīðrios*, in the Greek text, and translated them by the two nearest English equivalents. It may perhaps be regretted that they retained *everlasting* in Jude 6; for just as *aēl* does not always mean *for ever*, but often denotes continuity for a certain time, so *aīðios* seems there to mean the *continual* bondage of the rebel angels from the time of their revolt to the day of judgment; but the correctness of *everlasting* in Romans i. 20 is recognised by all. It is, however, of *eternal* that I desire to write: this is in fact *aīðrios*, first latinised, and then adopted into the English language; for *aīðr* written in Latin became *aevum*, and *aeternus* contracted from *aeviternus* is the adjective answering to *aevum* as *aīðrios* to *aīðr*. Eternal and *aīðrios* are therefore convertible terms in English and Greek respectively. But it is still maintained that the change from *everlasting* to *eternal* is a distinction without a difference, seeing that the two words are synonymous and express the same idea. Popular theology understands by eternity an endless existence in contradistinction to time. For the incorrect translation

to Paul himself, while he supposes the rest of the letter to have been written for Paul by a friend—probably Luke. Ebrard also thinks the letter was written at Paul's instance, but he holds that these four verses were added by the compiler. Zeller attributes the whole letter to a writer of later date, who added this supplement in order to make it pass as a Pauline Epistle. But surely, in such a case, the forger would have mentioned Paul in a more distinct and positive manner. The first two hypotheses have, critically, no ground to rest upon, and seem to have had no other design than to maintain a close connexion between the Epistle and Paul himself, since even the critics dare not go so far as to attribute the letter directly to the apostle.

of *aīōnios* and *aīōr* as *everlasting* and *for ever*, etc., in the English Bible has confused together two distinct ideas. But it is the duty of Greek scholars to aim at a clear perception of divine truth by careful study of the original language in which the apostles wrote; and English Christians ought to welcome gladly an argument which maintains the essential distinction between that eternal life which is their glorious birthright in Christ, and the everlasting existence which may be the portion and the curse of devils or irretrievably wicked men.

Let me therefore review the history of these two words in Greek literature and the Greek Bible. I have not traced back the adjective further than the time of Plato; but this is immaterial, as the substantive and adjective stand in the closest relation to each other throughout the Bible, and the substantive *aīōr* belonged to Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, and the Attic poets, as well as to the Septuagint, and had in all a clear, well defined meaning. The connexion of *aīōr* with *ἀημι* (*breathe*), is disputed; but its combination of the two ideas *life* and *time*, which might naturally originate in a conception of the breath of life, is very distinct in all the Greek poets. Occasionally it denoted some of the functions of physical life in lower animal forms; Hermes for instance, in the Homeric hymn addressed to him, is described as boring out with an auger the *life* of the tortoise. But generally it signified *human life*, or the definite term for which it lasts, *lifetime*. A single instance may suffice, the Homeric record of early death: "short was his span of life" (Il. iv. 478). The religious spirit of Greek poetry associated with *aīōr* a further idea of a destiny which controls the lives of men, so that it became a spontaneous expression of Greek belief in an overruling providence which shapes our lives to an appointed end. From the original conception of a *lifetime*, language readily evolved that of time as the limit within

which action reaches a final issue. Just as we have learned to speak of the *lifetime* of a nation or a race, of a creed or institution, of an opinion or a word, so the Greeks, by an unconscious use of figurative language, described any definite cycle of time as an *aἰών*; and the idea of time became eventually more prominent in the word than that of life. Hence Aristotle defines it as an *end*, primarily of human life, but secondarily of any existence. Plato applies the term *eternal* to the highest forms of divine creation, but calls the gods themselves *everlasting*.

After this *aἰών* and *aἰώνιος* passed into the hands of the Greek-speaking colony of Jews in Egypt, and were used by them for the expression of Hebrew thought in the Septuagint. They were naturally pressed into constant service, as embodying with more distinctness than any other Greek word that conception of a world under Divine government which formed the central doctrine of the Hebrew faith. Unfortunately *aἰών* has no exact equivalent in English, and the word *eternal* is almost unknown to the Old Testament, while the paraphrases *everlasting*, *for ever*, etc., which are adopted in our version, give a palpably false colour to the Hebrew thought. I shall perhaps best convey my idea of the language of the Septuagint by rendering *aἰώνιος* always *eternal*, while translating *aἰών* as *age*, *end*, or *life*, according to the shade of meaning which the context demands. English readers of the Bible may learn with surprise that *eternal* is hardly ever used as an epithet of Jehovah, apparently from a sense of its unworthiness and inadequacy, but is freely used to describe such transitory ordinances as the covenant of circumcision, the trumpet blowing, the scapegoat, the ritual of atonement, and the Levitical sabbath. Israel's possession of Canaan, the priesthood of Aaron, and the reign of the house of David are alike spoken of as lasting *to the end*, or *until the end*. It has been suggested that these things are only called

eternal, because they are typical of things eternal. But the Septuagint applies the epithet, not to the antitypes, but to the things themselves, and has no scruple in coupling it with other words which implied temporary and earthly existence, as for instance "eternal throughout your generations." The words clearly conveyed to the Greek reader simply the idea of permanent institutions established for the whole period of national existence, and no more. *Aiών* expressed in fact the same idea of a definite period that it does in other Greek literature; the length of the period is very various and can only be determined by the context. The covenant with Noah, that seedtime and harvest, summer and winter should not cease, was made "for eternal generations," that is to say, so long as the material world should last. The gates of the old Jebusite fortress of Sion were designated as *eternal* (Ps. xxiv. 7), apparently because they were formed in the solid rock and coeval with nature. Again *εἰς τ. aiώνα* often denotes simply *for life*: the slave who declined freedom in the sabbatical year became a slave *for life* (Exod. xxi. 6); God purposed to establish Moses' personal authority over His people *for life* (Exod. xix. 9); the Psalmist prayed to be led "in an eternal," i.e. a lifelong "way" (Ps. cxxxix. 24). Throughout the historical portions of Scripture there is the same variety and the same limitation of the period; it may mean the personal life of the author, the life of the king, the lifetime of Israel, or the existence of the world. And this holds good equally of prophecy: Isaiah for instance predicts the desolation of Idumea by "fire which shall not be quenched until the end" (*εἰς τ. aiώνα χρόνον*), yet the Greek text interprets this immediately afterwards as "much time," and limits the desolation to *generations* (Isa. xxxiv.).

The hope and expectation of Israel were specially concentrated on the coming and kingdom of the Messiah. His age was designated by evangelical prophecy as "the last

days," and His kingdom constituted the close of Israel's life: to this therefore belong the most glorious predictions of eternity, "all flesh is grass; . . . surely the people is grass; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand unto the end." But the same phrases are also used of the end of heathen nations.

It may seem that *aιών* is given as the measure of God's own existence in such passages as Deuteronomy xxxii. 40, "I live unto the end," but this is clearly a mistake; for in Exodus xv. 18 He is said to live not only to the end of the age, but also "for an age and beyond" (*εἰς τ. αἰώνα καὶ ἐπ’ αἰώνα καὶ ἔτι*); Psalm liv. (lv.) 20, describes Him as "existing before the ages"; and the beginning of Divine wisdom is dated "before the age" (Prov. viii. 23). In passages which speak of God's justice and mercy abiding *to the end*, the end naturally conceived is the limit of human life. So in doxologies the end contemplated is the compass of man's future life as the utmost conceivable limit of human praise; but there the language employed bears constant witness to its own inadequacy for expressing an indefinite futurity; for the writer resorts to such phrases as "for age upon age," "for the age and onwards" (*ἐπέκεινα*), "for the age and beyond" (*καὶ ἔτι*).

In spiritual and devotional language the nature of the case forbids any such precise limits as in historical; for spiritual aspiration reaches onward to a future of indefinite remoteness; and the periods of spiritual life do not admit of the same visible and tangible limits as those of outward life. But the conception of *the end* recurs constantly, sometimes in the form of *εἰς τ. αἰώνα*, sometimes in the alternative phrase, *εἰς τέλος*. On the whole, the one general conception of *aιών* throughout the Septuagint is that of finality.

In the later days of Judaism, however, *the end* is naturally postponed to another world, for the resurrection of man had then become the creed of religious Israelites; and they

recognised a life beyond the grave. Like Plato, they applied the term *eternal* to this second life. Plato, for instance, derided ancient mythology for the "eternal carouse" at the banquets of the gods assigned to the just as their reward after death. A pathetic passage in the Book of Tobit represents him under the crushing burden of accumulated misery craving dissolution as the only possible release, "Command therefore that I may now be delivered out of this distress and go into the eternal place" (Tob. iii. 6). He contemplates death as a life of eternal rest, a sort of oriental Nirvana. With this may be compared the picture of death as the home of man's life (Eccles. xii. 5), and that of the dead lying in darkness who shall not see light until the end, Ps. xlix. (xlviii.) 20. Messianic hope, and belief in man's immortality, combined to lift the prophet Daniel to nobler visions of the time to come. He beheld in spirit one like unto a son of man receiving an eternal dominion which shall not pass away, and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed (Dan. vii. 14), and it was revealed to him that the saints of the Most High should possess this kingdom till the end of an age of ages. Again he beheld that "many of them that sleep shall awake, some to eternal life, some to shame and eternal contempt," and that "they that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for the ages and beyond" (*kai ἐτι*, Dan. xii. 2, 3). The prophet's thought seems to pierce beyond the compass of time, and to embrace an indestructible kingdom; but this idea is not conveyed by the epithet *eternal*, which declares only that it shall last till the end of time, but is contained in the indefinite "beyond."

It may be observed that as the religious horizon of the Israelite enlarged, and his mental vision embraced a wider view of God's world, the dispensations of God were spoken of in the plural number, and greater cycles were mentioned which comprehended lesser within them (*αιώνες αἰώνων*)

but this multiplication in no way implied infinity, but the reverse; infinity is one, but times are manifold.

Several generations elapsed between the close of the Old Testament and the coming of Christ. The interval was fruitful in religious teaching and witnessed a strong religious revival. Under these influences theological phrases became current in the language of the people which affected the use of the word *aiών*. The faith which prophecy had kindled in the coming Messiah found expression in the application of the verbs μέλλειν and ἔρχεσθαι to Himself and all things connected with His coming; accordingly the Messianic age was designated *aiών μέλλων* and *aiών ἔρχομενος*, or sometimes *aiών ἐκεῖνος*, *the other life*, in contrast with the previous period, which was known as *this life* (*aiών οὗτος*). A moral significance also was often attached to the same phrase *aiών οὗτος*, like that which belongs to *this life* and *this world* in English, as expressing the temptations and irreligious tendencies of existing human life and society. The Messianic age was the culmination of Israel's history, including the whole period of His coming and His reign; it embraced the restoration, the judgment on enemies, and the triumphant dominion of the saints. The first coming was therefore placed *at the end of the ages* (*συντελείᾳ τ. aiώνων*, Heb. ix. 26); and *the ends of the ages* were said to have devolved on that generation of Christians (1 Cor. x. 11), while the final judgment was also placed *at the end of the age* (*συντέλεια τ. aiώνος*, Matt. xiii. 40).

But the thoughts that clustered round certain combinations of *aiών* could make no essential change in its own meaning; *that* was permanently fixed for every scribe that spoke Greek in the language of his Greek Bible. The word *eternal* developed a new force as it issued from the lips of Christian apostles; but this was not because the word itself was changed, but because it came in contact with new ideas and was made the vehicle of a new faith. Christians ceased

moreover to call some things *eternal* which the Hebrews had so designated; but this also implied a change of faith and not of language. The word itself retains in the Greek Testament the same force as in the Septuagint. In spite, for instance, of the new dignity imparted to it by Christian teaching, it is only once applied as an epithet to God, and that is in the closing doxology to the Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 26), which has with some reason fallen under suspicion of being an early Christian addition to the manuscript of St. Paul's epistle. The power and divinity of God are not described as *eternal*, but as *everlasting* (Rom. i. 20); His counsels are traced back beyond eternal times ($\pi\rho\delta\chi\rho\sigma\nu\omega\nu$ *aἰώνιων*, 2 Tim. i. 9), and beyond the ages ($\pi\rho\delta\tau.\alphaἰώνων$, 1 Cor. ii. 7). In the future likewise, St. Paul contemplates the Son's final surrender of His kingdom to the Father, eternal as it is elsewhere described (1 Cor. xv. 24). The *ages* on the other hand (whether *aἰών* is used in the singular or the plural) are continually identified with the creation and existence of man (compare $\tau.\dot{\alpha}\pi'\alphaἰώνος\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\hat{\omega}n$, Acts iii. 21; $\dot{\alpha}\pi\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\mu\mu\acute{e}v\pi\alpha$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\delta\tau.\alphaἰώνων$, Eph. iii. 9; $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\o\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau.\alphaἰώναs$, Heb. i. 2; $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\tau.\alphaἰώναs$, Heb. xi. 3). The use of *aἰών* in doxologies continues the same as in the Septuagint, except that plural forms are more frequent. In several passages we are almost forced to interpret *eis τ. αἰώνα* as *for life*; for instance, the immediate withering of the fig-tree responds most distinctly to the words of Christ, when we understand that the curse was laid on it, not *for ever*, but *for its life* (Matt. xxi. 19). The distinction between a bondservant and a son in John viii. 35 is obscure, until we read "the bondservant abideth not in the house *for life*, but the son abideth *for life*." All trace of exaggeration is removed from Peter's passionate protest, "Thou shalt not wash my feet *as long as I live*" (John xiii. 8); and from Paul's vehement declaration "if meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no

flesh *all my life long*" (1 Cor. viii. 13). Even *aiώνιος* retains in one passage the same force of *lifelong* that it has in Psalm cxxxix. 24; for in sending back Onesimus to his master Philemon, to render the faithful service of a Christian brother, St. Paul says, "Perhaps he was therefore parted from thee for a season, that thou shouldest have him back for a *lifelong* bondservant, no longer as a bondservant, but more": the relation between master and slave can hardly be conceived as extending beyond this life.

The sentence of *eternal fire* inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah denotes obviously their final desolation under God's providence in the course of nature (Jude 7). The same words acquire a much more awful meaning in Matthew xxv. from their connexion with the final judgment; the whole passage borrows its imagery from the Hebrew prophets, mainly from the visions of Daniel. The image of *fire* naturally recalls Isaiah's terrible picture of the fiery wrath of God against His enemies at His coming, and Malachi's description of the Second Advent as a refiner's fire. This is no place to discuss whether this *eternal fire*, and the *eternal punishment* (*κόλασις*), which our Lord in the same passage substitutes in place of the *eternal contempt* of which Daniel wrote, be of a penal or remedial character. Enough that the epithet *eternal* conveys a solemn warning that it will abide till God's appointed end.

There are, however, two conspicuous changes visible in the Greek Testament use of *aiών* and *aiώνιος*; the idea, which constantly recurs in the Septuagint, that the lifetime of Israel was God's appointed term, and that the institutions and ordinances of Israel were *eternal*, disappears from the New Testament, and the word *eternal* is transferred by all the writers of the Greek Testament to the sphere of man's personal or spiritual life. Both these changes can be distinctly traced to the lessons of Christ. The imperfect revelations of Hebrew prophecy had presented

the Messiah as a national king leading forth His people to battle, dyeing His garments with the blood of the slain, judging the vanquished, putting enemies to the sword, and riding in triumph into the gates of Sion. The apostles themselves clung obstinately to the hope of an outward restoration of the kingdom of David in the person of Christ; and until His final rejection by the voices of priest and people, and His actual death, they could not dissociate their hope of His future kingdom from the lifetime of the chosen nation. But as the lessons of His life and death sank by degrees into their minds, the Spirit taught them that Israelite institutions were not final, but only a temporary means of educating God's servants to a higher faith ; and they ceased to call them *eternal*.

Again the Jews did not connect the thought of an eternal life beyond the grave with a spiritual change, but regarded it as an inheritance to be earned by good deeds (Luke x. 25, xviii. 18). Christ's doctrine of a new life here on earth, as the great blessing which the Messiah came to give, startled His Jewish hearers. Nicodemus could not comprehend the mystery of a new birth of the Spirit. When Jesus spake of Himself as the bread of life, by which this new life was to be sustained, many of His disciples found it a hard saying, and walked no more with Him. Yet this doctrine constituted the very essence of Christianity. The apostles summed up the promises of the gospel in "Christ our life." To them He was "the life": and in Him "the life had been manifested." They had learned from their Master that this life, which is God's special gift in His Son and by His Spirit, was the only real life, so real in comparison with what men call life, and so distinct from it, that whosoever is minded to save what is called life shall lose what is indeed his life, and whosoever shall lose that life for Christ's sake shall find his real life (Matt. xvi. 25).

A name was further needed to distinguish this life in

Christ from ordinary life. Jesus might well have called it the *true* life ($\zeta\omega\eta\ \delta\lambda\eta\theta\imath\mu\eta\jmath$), just as He spoke of the *true* light, the *true* bread, and the *true* vine. So St. Paul has in one place borrowed the language of the Platonists to express the spirit of his Master's teaching, and entitled it "the life which is life indeed" ($\tau.\ \delta\eta\tau\omega\zeta\ \zeta\omega\hat{\eta}\varsigma$)—a reading which was changed in the received text, and appears in our Bible as "eternal life," but has now been replaced in the revised version of 1 Tim. vi. 19. The name which Christ and His apostles did adopt, was borrowed, as might be expected, from the Old Testament, and recurs more than forty times in the New,—*eternal life*. The name is full of meaning, if we bear in mind that the word *eternal* signifies permanence, not absolutely, but in relation to a life, whether long or short; and not an accidental prolongation of existence, but a permanence inherent in its original constitution. For Christ insisted strongly on permanence as a characteristic feature of the new life; He contrasted for instance "the meat that abideth unto eternal life," with "the meat that perisheth"; and the living water He had to give, with the water of Jacob's well: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall not thirst unto the end, but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a fountain ($\pi\eta\gamma\eta\jmath$) of water springing up unto eternal life." Again He said, "I am the living bread . . . if any man eat of this bread, he shall live unto the end." The same thought finds expression in His words, "He that believeth hath eternal life," and "this is eternal life, that they should know Thee, the only true God." In both places the word *eternal* declares the true nature of the believer's life, as lifted above the accidents of time and circumstance which fetter and limit human life on earth. As the Mosaic legislation was declared *eternal* independently of its eventual duration, because God originally stamped upon it the character of permanence, and identified it with the life of Israel as an

essential part of the national constitution, so Christ claimed for the new life this quality of permanence ; but in a far higher sense, as an essential property of its inherent nature. For outward life is transitory and its riches are unsubstantial, but permanence is a distinct attribute of the spiritual world. To declare a life permanent is to assert its vitality in the struggle with death, and by calling this spiritual life *eternal* Christ declared its triumph over death, and asserted the abiding power of His indwelling Spirit to resist death and survive the dissolution of the body. By revealing the intense reality of that unseen world which is eternal, and bringing it within immediate grasp of a living faith, He was enabled to use it as a leverage to overthrow the dominion of the flesh and the world.

Turning to apostolic language, we find St. John continually absorbed in the one topic of eternal life, and repeating the phrase three and twenty times. St. Paul has truly caught the spirit of his Master when he counts the affliction, under which the outward man is wasting away, a light burden beside "the eternal weight of glory," which the daily renewal of the inward man is working ; and adds, "for the things that are seen are temporal, the things that are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 17, 18). This I take to be the *eternal encouragement* to which he refers in 2 Thessalonians ii. 16. Again "the life which is life indeed," on which he bids Timothy charge the rich to lay hold, is clearly but another name for the life *eternal*, on which Timothy is himself to lay hold (1 Tim. vi. 12, 19). The Epistle to the Hebrews delights to rise above the gloomy contemplation of final judgment on the earthly Israel into the bright light of an ideal world. The Hebrews beheld with sorrowful amazement the worship, which had once been called eternal, sinking into ruin together with its covenant, its inheritance and its priesthood ; but the author had learned in the school of Christian philosophy how intensely real and

abiding is the spiritual life which God has given us in His Son. Hence his fondness for the word *eternal*: Christ is in his language Mediator of an eternal covenant, Author of an eternal salvation and of eternal redemption, the inheritance He bestows is eternal, His priesthood abides to the end. St. Peter speaks likewise of Christ's eternal glory and eternal kingdom. The vision of an angel "having an eternal gospel to proclaim in Revelation xiv. 6, seems a reminiscence of Isaiah xl. 8, "The word of our God shall stand unto the end" (compare 1 Pet. i. 25).

Some modern theology seems to me to degrade this Christian ideal by confounding eternal life with an everlasting existence in the future; and I desire to bring into clearer view this unseen but eternal world, which is ever within us and lies close about us. Reason may teach us, as it taught Plato, to believe in the indestructibility of a human soul; and there is no difficulty in reconciling this with the Christian doctrine of a glorified body and a new earth as well as a new heaven to come. But assuredly faith in the present reality of the invisible world lies nearer to the heart of religion; and to this sphere belongs our eternal life. For it is God's gift to us now from heaven; in spite of present weakness of the flesh it has a real source of strength hidden with God in Christ; it is rich in ever-growing knowledge and love of God, as well as promise of the life to come. Why then should we be anxious about the end, so we be drawing ever nearer to our God! the end is in His hands, and we may safely leave it there. Enough for us that we shall be like Him and shall see Him as He is: this is eternal life.

F. RENDALL.

THE REVISED VERSION OF ISAIAH.

II.

THE second part of the Book of Isaiah (or let me call it 2 Isaiah) can now be somewhat better appreciated than before in its varied and distinctive beauty. The broad space between chapters xxxix. and xl. prepares the reader to expect something widely different from most of that which has gone before, and the frequent paragraph-divisions warn him to bestow special attention on the transitions of thought. One may hope that before very long some members of our increasing band of thoughtful though not erudite Bible-students will begin to treat the prophetic writings precisely as Bernhard Weiss has treated the New Testament books in his valuable *Biblical Theology* (Clark, Edinburgh), viz. as presenting more or less independent types of religious truth and belief. Certainly no book contains such a wide range of thought as the Book of Isaiah, and we may hope that students of doctrine will not wait for questions of date to be finally settled before they compare and contrast, to the exceeding profit of popular theology, the ideas and expressions of the several distinct portions which make up the so-called Book of Isaiah.

That the revision of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is satisfactory from the point of view of the history of doctrine (or rather, of religious ideas), it would be too much to assert; and if I were to survey it in this aspect, my second article would be more unfavourable than justice upon the whole requires. I spoke just now of the “varied and distinctive beauty” of this part of Isaiah, or, for the public is surely ripe for the expression, not so much “Isaiah” as the Isaianic literature—on the question involved, there is no essential difference between critics, as Klostermann and Bredenkamp have recently shown in publications supposed to represent

the orthodox section of German theology.¹ It is primarily with the view of illustrating 2 Isaiah as a "literature" and as a work, which however composite be its origin, can charm and delight the reader, that this too brief paper is written, and if the meaning and history of religious expressions should now and then be brought into view, this will be only a subordinate feature of the article. The Revisers have left so much undone which from a theological student's point of view they ought to have done, that I could not enter into the religious phraseology of 2 Isaiah as I should have much liked to do.

It may seem to be unimportant whether, in xl. 3, we render, *that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye*, or, *that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness*. But if this fine piece of deeply felt rhetoric could only have been printed in parallel lines, every one would have seen that the one rendering was wrong, and the other right. Respect for ancient views of grammar can alone have prevented the Revisers from prefixing to the invisible speaker's proclamation, "Hark, one crieth!" Pass on to v. 9. There observe the two exegetical traditions; the margin of R.V. (=A.V. text) represents the one; the text expresses the other. Why the Septuagint and the Targum should have had this honour done to them, I do not know. Putting Hitzig aside, it seems to me that the most influential modern exegesis is in favour of A.V. Besides, *O thou that tellest*, etc., is a doubtful translation. More accurate would be, "*O company that telleth*," etc. But for reading in church it is certainly a bad exchange that we have made; lovers of rhythmical English will, I think, bear me out in this assertion. Another proof of the scholarship often to be found in the margins meets us in v. 24, where the text of R.V. (=A.V.) seems to make the prophet contradict him-

¹ See Klostermann, art. "Jesaja," Herzog-Plitt, *Realencyclopädie*, Vol. vi. p. 585, etc.; Bredenkamp, *Der Prophet Jesaia* (1887), p. 227.

self. In the next scene (chap. xli.) Jehovah Himself is the speaker, with the exception of the graphic "aside" of the prophet in vv. 5-7. It is melancholy that there should be no margin on *islands*; there is one, of course, at Isaiah xi. 11, but, considering that chapters xl.-lxvi. form (as the Revisers themselves suggest) a separate prophetic writing, the student needs a reminder that modern scholarship may be decidedly against the rendering piously retained in the text (cf. EXPOSITOR, 1887, 2, p. 451). In v. 2 the Revisers' correction seems to me scarcely intelligible. *To his foot* is Hebrew; the English equivalent is "to follow him." Nor am I sure that the ordinary reader can help misinterpreting the second half of v. 4. A.V. gave a semicolon after "last"; R.V. gives a comma. A.V. might be explained with substantial accuracy; R.V. lends itself best to an interpretation which is certainly not a possible one. The stops as they now stand almost compel one to take "I am he" as an answer to the question, "Who hath wrought and done it?" The consequence is that one of the most important theological statements of the prophet is made of none effect. It is true, that **אֶنֹּכְךָ** cannot be translated except paraphrastically. It means either "I am the only independent Being," or, "I am (ever) the same." Mr. Rodwell adopts the latter sense here, and with more justice perhaps at xlvi. 4. Krüger prefers the former paraphrase. His remarks on the place which such a statement occupies in the religious system of the prophet, may be consulted with advantage (*Essai sur la Théologie d'Ésaïe xl.-lxvi.*, p. 16. Paris, 1881).

I cannot help making one or two more objections at this point. *Raised up* in v. 5 is unfortunately an ambiguous word. The phrase recurs several times, and its meaning is better expressed by Mr. Rodwell's rendering "I have stirred up" (*i.e.* impelled to activity).¹ The second margin on the

¹ I am indebted to the author's kindness for a copy of the second edition of

same verse was inserted out of deference to some eminent commentators, but is for all that scarcely defensible ; at any rate, many other omitted renderings had a far better claim to be recorded. That there are no marks of parenthesis opening *v.* 5 and closing *v.* 7, is a loss to the student. And if the graphic present is given in *v.* 3, why not also in *v.* 6 ? Mr. Rodwell's version is not open to this criticism ; he boldly but not inaccurately gives the whole of this passage (*vv.* 5-7) in the present tense, except at the very beginning (where perhaps “have seen it” would be better than “saw it”). Verses 8-10 form one impassioned sentence in R.V. Our prophet is fond of such oratorical appeals, and the Revisers have done him full justice. In *v.* 25 an important correction of tense is made ; the reference is not to time future, but to time present. Cyrus is come, and has begun his victorious career (hence, “cometh” might be better than *shall come*). *One that calleth* is perhaps right ; but it is at least equally possible that Bredenkamp's emendation should be adopted, and that we should render the corrected text, “do I proclaim his name.” This improves the parallelism, and is in harmony with passages like xlvi. 3, 4 ; & and ‘, ’ and ‘ are for different reasons often confounded.

In chap. xlii. we meet with the first of those sublime descriptions of the Servant of Jehovah which makes this prophecy so specially memorable to Christians. Great care has been taken not to interfere more than was absolutely necessary with wordings so familiar and so sacred to the Church at large. In *vv.* 1-4 the only alteration is *in truth* for *unto truth* ; doubtless for the sake of intelligibility. I should have preferred “truthfully” or “faithfully,” since the preposition indicates that the preaching of the Servant is according to the standard of truth. Passing on to another striking but enigmatical utterance, we find one

his scholarly version of Isaiah (London, 1886), which has been carefully revised, but is unfortunately not free from printer's errors.

great improvement. The rendering *Who is blind as he that is perfect* (v. 19), has some ancient authority on its side; Symmachus gives ὁ τέλειος, Kimchi תָּמִים, and Ibn Ezra regards מְשֻׁלָּם as synonymous with צַדִּיק “righteous.” None of these versions does justice to the linguistic usage nor to the conjugation (“Pual”), and the revisers have done well to substitute *Who is blind as he that is at peace with me* (more strictly, “that has been brought into friendship with me”). Comp. Job v. 23, “And the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee” [or, “rendered friendly to thee”]. Some readers may object to R.V. that it fails to produce a good parallelism. But “peace” and “friendship” imply a covenant, and the covenant between Jehovah and Israel stipulates for protection on the one side, and willing service on the other. “Who is devoid of sensibility like him who has been brought into covenant-relations to the great teacher and work-master?” This is not an unworthy meaning. But one misses a serviceable alternative rendering (for the two margins show no exegetical tact, and were probably only meant to warn the reader of the difficulty of the word). In the first half of the verse, we read, “(Who is) deaf as my messenger whom I send?” We seem to require in the parallel line some noun which shall describe the qualities of a faithful envoy. Now there is one quality which must take the precedence of every other, viz. quickness to discern the wishes of the sender. *Behold, as the eyes of servants are upon the hand of their master, and as the eyes of a maid are upon the hand of her mistress, so our eyes are upon Jehovah our God* (Ps. cxxiii. 2), this is doubtless the expression of the faithful messenger and servant—the ideal Israel. If so, “the God-devoted one” gives the sense more accurately than the rendering adopted by the Revision Company. Surely it is not a matter of indifference that this rendering has been ignored in the margin of R.V. Dean Bradley has well observed (*The Book of Job*, p. 41)

that the passive virtue of resignation is equally essential to Christianity and to Islam ; Kingsley has even called Job “the first great Moslem.” And does not the prophet’s descriptive term “*Meshullām*” (it occurs in Ezra viii. 16, x. 15, 29 as a proper name) remind us forcibly that Bible-religion insists on what we call resignation as an active not less than as a passive quality of the soul ?

I would couple with this, as I trust, not misplaced exposition a caution to the student against too easy emendations of the text. How plausible it seems to correct a *Mem* into a *Kheth*, and read, with the Jewish scholars Krochmal and Grätz, כְּנִשְׁלָה “as he that is sent” (comp. “my messenger whom I send”) ? But we purchase this plainness at a high price ; we destroy, it appears to me, the fine proportions of prophetic description of the true Israel. Passing over several corrections of less significance, and warning the student not to neglect the margins at xlvi. 21, xlvi. 13, we arrive at a passage of much importance for the historical interpretation of the book. If A.V. be correct, the prophet looks back upon the capture of Babylon by Cyrus as past ; if R.V., this event is certain, but is still future. If A.V. had been retained, a corrected exposition of 2 Isaiah would have been scarcely possible, for in xlvi. 2 the breaking of the hundred gates of brass is represented as a mighty proof of predictive power. For the grounds of the correction, see Driver’s *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 152. Whether *the ships of their rejoicing* is English, may be doubted. The late Prof. Weir of Glasgow even doubted whether, consistently with usage, we ought to render thus ; certainly a margin, “Heb., their shouting” might suitably have been added. It is even doubtful whether the text is correct ; at any rate, the context rather suggests the rendering “the ships of their lamenting.” Possibly רַגֵּן here may have both meanings, “rejoicing” and “lamenting,” just as הַיְדָה does in Isa. xvi. 9, 10. A.V. v. 27 *interpreters for teachers* is a decided

improvement. The prophets and priests are regarded as representing Israel before Jehovah and Jehovah before Israel.

In chap. xliv. the margins deserve special attention (with the exception of that upon *declare* in v. 7). The retention of A.V. for v. 7 is fatal to the intelligibility of the passage. Jehovah justifies His exclusive claims by the constant stream of prophecy proceeding from Him. From the point of view of apologetics there is hardly a more interesting passage in the book; but no one would guess this from the version which has been again sanctioned by the Revision Company. No one, I hope, will believe that it was sanctioned by a majority of the Revisers; that indeed would be incredible. Still the fact remains that for some reason or other the correct rendering failed to obtain a two-thirds majority—a fresh proof of the extreme difficulty of obtaining a faithful translation under the circumstances of the Revision.

Chap. xlv. contains one notable correction materially affecting the sense. It is in the second clause of v. 9, where A.V., as the italics show, virtually emends the text, by no means to the advantage of the reader. *A potsherd among the potsherds of the earth* means one of a collection of insignificant creatures (so the Peshitto took it; the Septuagint and Theodotion imply a curious misreading). I do not say that the translation is perfectly clear. As Prof. Buhl has pointed out to me, the sense which ought to be given to the imperfects is the potential—"What canst thou make? What canst thou beget? What canst thou bring forth?" The passage is strongly satirical. In spite of the fact that the very existence of the pot is a proof of the ability of the potter, the foolish thing presumes to question this. The application is obvious. To deny the capacity of Jehovah to preserve His people was tantamount to denying His capacity to create, and that He could create, Israel itself (the "ancient people" of xliv. 7, perhaps) was a speaking

evidence. V. 11 is also somewhat obscure in A.V. and R.V.; but there is no help for it if even a small emendation is to be forbidden.

In chap. xlvi. the archaism *your carriages* (v. 1) becomes *the things that ye carried about*. In v. 8, *show yourselves men* remains, though certainly the $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\alpha\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ of the Septuagint gives a much more suitable sense. Long ago Dathe proposed שׁבְּתָה, and since then Prof. de Lagarde and I have made the same suggestion independently; “be deeply ashamed” is surely what the context requires. The margin *stand fast* is philologically possible, but not the right expression here.

The next chapter is finely given in A.V., and has been carefully retouched in R.V. *Accept no man* (v. 3) gives one possible rendering; the root-meaning is “to strike (upon),” and so “to meet.” We might also render “I shall not meet any man (who can prove his manhood in battle),” taking “man” in a pregnant sense, as in lix. 16, Jer. v. 1. This substantially agrees with Symmachus and the Vulgate. The American Revisers, however, prefer the rendering “spare no man”; this is certainly more energetic and therefore more suitable to such a context. It is supported by Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, and Delitzsch, and the choice seems to me to lie between this rendering and that suggested above.

In chap. xlix. the margins are again important as witnesses to a more scholarly rendering than has found its way into the text, or, shall I say? to the anxious care of the Revisers not to interfere too much with a book so familiar and so dear. In v. 10, *not as silver* has the support of the Vulgate (*quasi argentum*); it gives a fine meaning—God remembers that “we are but flesh,” and does not try us “as silver,” which is “purified seven times” (Ps. xii. 6). The devout reader gains much by this new translation. Literally, the Hebrew means either “in (the manner of)

silver," or "with silver"; the latter sense is here obviously unsuitable. Segond renders, "pour retirer de l'argent"; Reuss, "sans obtenir d'argent"; *i.e.* (as Ewald), "my refining did not result in the production of pure metal"; but what place has such a statement in this context? Students of doctrine will be attracted more by another passage in this chapter. The A.V. of *v.* 16 gives, "and now the Lord God (*i.e.* Jehovah), and his Spirit, hath sent me"; the R.V., "and now the Lord God hath sent me, and his spirit." What the student of doctrine will make of this, however, I do not feel sure. He will conclude either that the prophet had no particular meaning, or that the sense is that which he (the student) desires to get from the passage. No one can blame the Revisers for their caution; a body representing not merely scholarship, but churches, could not allow itself to give a definite view of a passage like this, which requires a preliminary judgment upon the history of doctrinal progress in the Jewish Church. Again and again we see how earnestly the Revisers have endeavoured to keep philology distinct from exegesis, and to give what the Hebrew words may reasonably be taken to mean apart from the complicated process of interpretation. And we can also see now and then how still more earnestly they have sought to keep their version doctrinally colourless. The result of their endeavours in both cases has not been entirely satisfactory. Philological cannot always be kept distinct from exegetical considerations, nor can a translator always evade the responsibility of a definite opinion as to the stage of religious insight at which his author has arrived. It would be interesting, but would take us too far away, to notice in some detail how individual translators have avoided the objections to which the Revision Company is justly liable. We may at least be thankful that the Hebrew order of the words is retained in R.V.

In xlix. 5 the Revisers have adopted the reading pre-

supposed by our earliest critical authority (the Septuagint), and also by Aquila and the Targum. It is noteworthy that the Massoreth includes this passage among the fifteen in which נִשׁ is written, and נִשׁ ought to be read ; no doubt this reading is the correct one (cf. Ps. c. 3). That there is no margin on v. 7, is a loss to students only ; the English at any rate is clear enough. The French translators follow suit, Segond rendering weakly, “à celui qu'on méprise” ; Reuss, “à celui qui est méprise des hommes.” Yes ; the sense is even too clear, but this may compensate for the unnecessarily obscure meaning given to many other passages both in A.V. and in R.V. The interesting margin on v. 17 gives an excellent sense ; the reading has been adopted lately by Prof. Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 400) and Prof. Bredenkamp (Wellhausen's orthodox successor at Greifswald). In v. 25 the marginal reading should still more certainly be adopted ; and few persons would have found fault with the Revisers if they had discarded the obvious scribe's error which now occupies the text.

In l. 11, *gird yourselves* (i.e. equip yourselves, xlv. 5) *with firebrands* replaces the curious schoolboy rendering *compass yourselves with sparks*.

Chap. li. is now a fine piece of prophetic oratory ; how much v. 19 is improved, both in sense and even in rhythm, if my own ear can be trusted ! The margin on v. 6 will give rise to reflexions on the difference between classic elegance and primitive energy of diction ; that on v. 15, to some surprise at the wide range of possible meanings of Hebrew verbs (*to stir up* and *to still* are both referable to a very simple physical root-meaning, on which see Delitzsch's commentary on Job xxvi. 12). “Stilleth” is philologically possible, though exegetically impossible ; Sept. adopts this sense in Job xxvi. 12, though not here (obviously because different translators have been at work).

But that wonderful fifty-third chapter (with which lii.

13–15 is closely connected) beckons us, and we cannot pause again till we reach it. How carefully it has been done, will be apparent the more we look into it. *Deal wisely* is surely, from a modern English point of view more appropriate than *deal prudently*; the margin is equally allowable, and the faithful interpreter will admit that, as also in Jer. xxiii. 5, both meanings are probably intended. The parenthesis in v. 14 is a great help in such a complex sentence. *Sprinkle* could not but be left in possession, though no longer maintained by many philologists of distinction; *startle* is a suitable sense, though whether it can be justified except by the help of emendation may be doubted. The Septuagint gives *θαυμάσονται*, but whether this is a guess, or a rendering, or a paraphrase, cannot be determined. The troublesome and inaccurate futures have disappeared from v. 2. The comma in v. 3 not only testifies to the scholarship of the Revisers, but promotes the effective reading of the verse, and the important correction in the second half of the verse has been made with pious regard to the ancient rhythm. Hengstenberg, in fact, stands alone among modern critics in his advocacy of the “authorized” rendering. The correction in v. 7 does, I fear, spoil the familiar rhythm; but if we make a due pause at *oppressed*, the sound of the passage is not unpleasing; and certainly we ought not to complain of the removal of a tautology. Perhaps too many readers will agree on the increased pathos of the close of the verse in R.V. In v. 8 the interpreters are greatly divided, but there could be no difference of opinion as to the wrongness of A.V. The margins give an adequate view of other possible meanings; but perhaps nowhere in Isaiah is paraphrase more called for than in this deep chapter. *Taken* for instance—what does this mean? Violently taken or kindly released? Our Revisers indeed have only avoided paraphrasing *generation* by inserting in italics the words *among them*. In v. 9 *he made* had of course to be altered.

The Hebrew simply means “one made,” but for clearness’ sake (because *his grave* followed) the Revisers preferred *they made*. *Because* has of course been changed into *although* (cf. Job xvi. 17). With great honesty the Revisers have recorded in the margin that the Hebrew has *in his deaths* (not, *death*), with a reference to Ezek. xxviii. 8, 10, which however seems to me only in point if we may correct בְּמִתְּיוֹן into בְּמִתְּיוֹן. The margin gives the literal meaning of an important religious phrase, and one may add, is the more suitable rendering in this context. It is God that justifies (Isa. l. 8, Rom. viii. 33 A.V.); it is the privilege of His greatest servants to “turn many to righteousness” (Dan. xii. 3). The antithesis at the end of v. 12 (comp. those in vv. 4, 7, 10) would be more pleasing to the ear if *bare* had been changed into *had borne*; then a slight pause might be made by the reader after *he*, and the full force of the contrast would be brought out.

I turn to another specially difficult section (lv. 9-lvii. 14), and may remark in passing how carefully the paragraph divisions have been framed in R.V. Some readers would perhaps desire to break up some of them, but whether the instructed student would agree in this, may be greatly doubted. In lvii. 12, *from his quarter* is cleverly corrected into *from every quarter*, with the margin *one and all*, which gives the true sense. The close of the verse is still more improved; how often has *and much more abundant* grated on one’s ear in church! it reminds one a little of the *durable clothing* at the end of chap. xxiii. (A.V. and R.V.). *A day great beyond measure* is a big phrase which suits the tone of the speakers. In lvii. 6, *valley* is substituted for *stream* to the great advantage of the local colouring; of course, the torrent beds are meant (the wadys) which form a common feature in the Palestinian landscape. In lvii. 13, the vigorous marginal rendering should be noted; it is equivalent to a paraphrase, and more such margins might,

but for considerations of space, very probably have been added. *Faint away*, for *fail*, is another such margin (lvii. 16). In lviii. 10 shall I call the margin an explanation or a new rendering? Certainly I do not understand A.V., with which the text of R.V. agrees. In lviii. 13 the removal of a comma is as useful as its insertion was in lii. 3.

In lix. 10 note the vigorous clause which concludes the verse in R.V. Doubtless the phrase is somewhat obscure; yet the context and the comparison of xxii. 29, xcii. 15, suggests the rendering of R.V. (fatness being taken as a symbol of strength). The margin is probably given *pour acquit de conscience*, not on the ground of its probability; is there any such root as **דָּוַנְ** to be dark? No doubt some early exegetical authorities support this rendering, which we find as early as Jerome (who renders, *in caliginosis*); but Rabbinical tradition like the traditional renderings of other literatures, needs the most careful testing. In v. 16 the margin again gives the true sense, but perhaps a point of contact with liii. 12 seemed desirable. Verse 19 in R.V. is one of the most striking and poetical which I can remember. I do not deny that the A.V. may also be described by these epithets; unfortunately it has been given up by the unanimous voice of critics.

In lxii. 6 I am thankful for the promotion of the splendid phrase *the LORD's remembrancers* from the margin (see A.V.) into the text. It may be illustrated by the custom of crying aloud in the words of Ps. xliv., "Awake, why sleepest thou, O LORD," which was at length abolished by John Hyrcanus (Talm. Bab., *Sota*, 48a; comp. Perowne, *The Psalms*, i. 207). I quite feel with John Hyrcanus that there is a certain want of faith in the idea of "reminding" or "awakening" Jehovah; at the same time, a phrase like this stirs one's feelings of sympathy. It may be better for us too sometimes to remind Jehovah (why may we not

use the word intelligently?) of His promises. When we have recited them, perhaps we shall believe them more intensely, and no longer think that Jehovah has forgotten or rejected us.

The above may suffice as specimens of the manifold interest of the Revised Version of 2 Isaiah.¹ If it has turned out to be somewhat unequal, that is the inevitable result of the conditions under which the work was performed. This latter part of Isaiah, as rendered by the old translators, has so enshrined itself in the memory that we can hardly bear the well-meant alterations of scholarly hands. What we want is, as Mr. Matthew Arnold says, deeply to enjoy, and we instinctively feel that to enjoy a thoroughly revised version, would involve close preliminary study, and an accustoming of the ear to new rhythms. We enjoy the English Bible of our fathers, and shrink from a change which may disturb our intellectual repose. I am not speaking, of course, in my own name. No one craves to enjoy the Biblical Literature more than I do, but it must be an enjoyment which has not first to excuse and justify itself at the bar of scholarship and truth. Nothing is so enjoyable as pure and primitive Biblical truth. "The words of the LORD are pure words" (Ps. xii. 6), and the labours of the Revisers will not be thrown away, if they induce the Church to look beyond theologies to the facts and words of the historic revelations.

T. K. CHEYNE.

¹ I cannot, however, help pointing out, though but in a footnote, the corrections of the tenses in lxiii. 6, 74. The consonants of the text leave the tense open. Comp. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, ed. 3, p. 247.

THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION.

"And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that *holy* thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."—*LUKE i. 35 (A.V.).*

" . . . The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: therefore also that which is to be born¹ shall be called holy, the Son of God."—(R.V.).

OF all the improvements which we owe to the Revised Version none is greater, in my judgment, than the change which it makes upon the sense of this verse. According to the A.V., as we naturally read it, Jesus Christ *became* "the Son of God"—if not exclusively yet in a new sense—in virtue of His miraculous conception: according to the R.V. it was His *holiness*, not His Sonship, which was due to His miraculous conception. According to the uniform tenor of the New Testament, when "God sent forth His Son made of a woman," instead of thereby investing Him with any new Sonship, He simply clothed His Son with our flesh; but since He who was to "take away the sin of the world" must Himself "know no sin," provision was made to secure this—in the august way here only explicitly announced but abundantly verified in the historical records of the life that issued out of it, and everywhere else in the New Testament taken for granted.

But does the R.V. give the true sense of the verse? Opinion is certainly divided, and there are weighty authorities on both sides. But surely the fairest way of deciding the question is to let the evangelist express himself in his own way; and if we find him using in the very next chapter the same form of expression in the sense of the R.V. of this passage, and what is more, if in other places where the same form of expression occurs it can mean nothing else, we

¹ The words "of thee" in the received text and A.V., though they have respectable authority, are beyond doubt an addition to the genuine text.

have abundant justification of the R.V. here. The phrase in question is “That which is to be born shall be called holy” (*ἄγιον κληθήσεται*)—the predicate being put before the verb. Now turn to chap. ii. 22, “They brought Him up to Jerusalem to present Him to the Lord, as it is written in the law of the Lord. Every male that openeth the womb *shall be called holy to the Lord*” (*ἄγιον τ. Θ. κληθήσεται*). Then turn to Matt. ii. 23, “That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that He *should be called a Nazarene*” (*ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*). Also, chap. v. 9, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they *shall be called sons of God*” (*νιοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσεται*), and in v. 19 twice, “Whoever shall break one of these least commandments . . . *shall be called least* (*ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται*) in the kingdom of heaven : but whosoever shall do and teach them, he *shall be called great* (*μέγας κληθήσεται*).”

There is thus so clear an *usus loquendi* in the phrase employed in our verse, that unless there is something about other words in the same verse, or in the nature of the case, to render this sense inadmissible, we are not entitled to render it otherwise than as it stands in the R.V. But there is nothing of the kind. The only real objection to it is that it would involve two predicates—“shall be called holy” and “[shall be called] the Son of God”—which in that case would require a *kai*, an “and,” between the two predicates, and there is none (so Meyer). But there is no need to take it so. Just take the one predicate to be “shall be called *holy*,” and the next clause to be what grammarians would call an epexegetical definition of what is meant by “that which is to be born,” namely no other than “the Son of God,” and a clear and worthy sense will be the result—as if to say, “The effect of this mysterious operation upon the blessed Virgin will be that her offspring will be none other than the Son of God, *born holy* in a sense absolutely unique.”

Godet, who takes the same view of the verse as Meyer and the A.V., makes one poor objection to the other sense. "With the predicate *holy* the verb should have been, not 'shall be called holy,' but 'shall be holy'; for *holy* is not a title." Of course it is not, nor was meant to be so, but to characterize the newborn One. When it was said in the law of the Lord, "Every firstborn male shall be called *holy*," does any one suppose that to mean that every firstborn male Israelite got this as a title?

Since then there are only these small objections to the rendering of the R.V., and this is the *fixed usage* in such phrases, we shall hold that it expresses the true sense of the verse before us, and will now proceed to examine the attempts made to explain away the great truth thus expressed.

That this truth should be rejected as a historical fact by the negative, anti-supernatural school of critics is only what we expect. It is with them a foregone conclusion. But it is interesting to observe how they get rid of it. The genuineness of the text being beyond dispute, both in Luke's explicit announcement of a miraculous conception and in Matthew's presupposition of the precise nature of it, they view it simply as one of the many floating traditions of the story of Christ's life, which are to be accepted or rejected according to such canons of criticism as each one for himself may think fit to test them by. In this case, who has not read of those prodigies of strength and wisdom and valour who were fabled to have been *god-born*? and what could be more natural than that one so transcendently great in goodness—so God-like in character—should be thought to have had a mother in some way divinely gifted from the moment of her conception, to give birth to one so uncommon? To this it might be answered that such legends were quite foreign to Jewish ideas, and the answer

would be pertinent enough. But even here there may be an element of truth. For what could give rise to such legends of great heroes being *god-born*, but a presumption that supreme human excellence must be due to some peculiarity of birth. And certainly if there be such a law, this would be the crowning expression of it!¹

Schleiermacher's way of getting rid of the supernatural character of the birth I should pass by unnoticed, were it not for his great name, and still more because he has been substantially followed not only by the best of the negative critics, but by some who are better affected to the higher features of evangelical Christianity (I refer especially to Meyer). Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay* on this Gospel lies before me in an English translation, issued anonymously upwards of sixty years ago, with an elaborate introduction by the translator (the late Bishop Thirlwall, in his early days).² The first thirty pages are spent in a laboured comparison and contrast of the first two chapters of this Gospel and the corresponding narrative in the first Gospel, —wearisome as well as painful reading it is. The gist of it may be given in a few sentences. The first chapter of Luke is a piece of patchwork, consisting of detached bits

¹ "We are referred to traditions concerning the birth of great men from pure virgins ($\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), as for instance Buddha. . . . Such traditions are by no means opposed to biblical history—as little indeed as are analogous presentations of an expected Redeemer. On the contrary, they bear witness to the very correct notion that noble minds are to be found in every nation; that nothing can result in the way of natural procreation (nor therefore from the womb of mankind), which could correspond with the ideal represented in the human mind; they vouch for the general desire of such a fact, for the longing after it, and hereby for the historical realization. . . . To this must be added that the narrative of the procreation of Christ through the Holy Ghost stands in a necessary connexion with His entire destination to be the Redeemer of infirm humanity, since it would have been impossible for any one who had himself sprung from the sinful human race to heal the wounds from which it suffers."—Olshausen.

² *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke.* By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher. With an Introduction by the Translator, containing an account of the controversy on the three first Gospels since. Ep. Marsh's Dissertation. London, 8vo, 1825.

of written tradition, with connecting clauses inserted probably by the writer who wrought them into one narrative. The story of the angel's visit to Mary is certainly a piece by itself, cast in a poetic form but originating possibly in some historical fact. Matthew's narrative is naked prose and more of a historical-looking character. The two stories, however, are totally contradictory, and "all attempts to reconcile them seem only elaborate efforts of art to which one should not needlessly resort. Luke supposes everywhere that before the birth of Jesus—which took place at Bethlehem quite accidentally—Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth. Matthew, on the contrary, knows nothing of any accidental cause of the birth happening at Bethlehem, and clearly supposes that Joseph, but for the intervention of some particular circumstances, would have returned to Judæa after his flight, and therefore manifestly takes that, and not Galilee, to have been his usual place of abode" (p. 48). Is any reply to this required? Hard pushed indeed must that penetrating critic have been to find a contradiction here. Matthew had no occasion to refer to the imperial edict which brought every male Israelite to his tribal city to be enrolled. The object he had being to state how Joseph's honourable scruples as to Mary's condition were divinely removed, he simply records the fact that, this done, he "took unto him his wife and" lived with her in the manner there stated "until she had brought forth a son"—"Jesus." On his return from Egypt Joseph did indeed intend to settle in Judæa, but that does not prove that he had lived there before, but that "Bethlehem of Judæa" being "the city of David," the royal city, he deemed it the fitting place for the infant King of Israel to be brought up, until "warned of God in a dream, he withdrew into Galilee and dwelt in Nazareth." But Luke's express object being to relate what brought Joseph to Bethlehem, and how he brought his betrothed wife with him, though on the eve

of her confinement, goes on to relate the annunciation to the shepherds of the birth of a Saviour that day at Bethlehem, with their visit to the Babe, and His presentation in the temple, not even mentioning His return thereafter to Nazareth. He simply presupposes it, for the very next scene which he relates brings the family to Jerusalem when He was twelve years old, without even telling us where they came from—Nazareth being their understood place of residence. I am almost ashamed to have said so much on so forced an attempt to make the two evangelists contradict each other.

The most reverential critic of the negative school, whose deep sympathies, like De Wette's, were with the very truths whose historical basis he seeks to undermine—I mean Keim—follows Strauss in another poor objection, that Luke places the angel's visit to Mary *before* the conception, whereas Matthew makes the same angel's visit to be *after* the conception, and not to Mary, but to Joseph; the two stories therefore being contradictory. Incredible, one might think, that any contradiction existed here. Yet even Meyer endorses it: as if one visit could not be paid to Mary to prepare her for that taking place on her which had never been known to occur before, and could not have been believed but for a Divine assurance, and a subsequent visit to Joseph to set his mind at rest about the condition of his betrothed could not also take place!

As to the *poetry* which Schleiermacher makes of the angel's annunciation to the Virgin—as if that relieved us of the necessity of viewing it as fact—exalted indeed is the strain, and all-worthy of the stupendous revelation it conveyed; but that only helps to lift the spirit into a preparedness to welcome the expected event.¹ For myself, I have always felt at a loss to say whether the sublimity or

¹ “The angel touches upon the most sacred of mysteries, and his speech becomes a song.”—*Gadet*.

the exquisite delicacy of the language here employed is the more to be admired. Calvin seems to have been struck with it, and the best expositors have felt it.

Having thus disposed of the sense and the language of the verse, we are prepared to deal with the objections to the fact itself. They are three; but formidable-looking though they are, a little examination will suffice to show that they are groundless.

I. *The silence of the Gospels about the miraculous conception save at the outset of the first and third ones, is held to be fatal to its historical truth.*

Evidently this objection is deemed unanswerable, for every writer on the negative side, from Schleiermacher downwards, appeals to passages in which our Lord is spoken of exactly as He would be if He were the legitimate offspring of Joseph and Mary. "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses and Simon and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us?" Such language from His Nazarene townsmen, who must have known everything about the family, is surely unaccountable if any such unheard-of birth had taken place. But in the whole body of the evangelical narrative not a word occurs implying that He was born otherwise than we ourselves. Most of all, in the fourth Gospel, if written by the Apostle John, to whom our Lord on the cross committed His mother, and who took her to his own home—how is it that even there there is no hint of such a birth, the fact of which, if he knew it not before, he must have learnt from her?

Now in the Synoptic Gospels it is quite true that there is no indication that anybody knew of our Lord's peculiar manner of birth. I believe it was entirely unknown to the nation at large—unknown even to the Twelve—unknown indeed to His own family—unknown, as I think, to all but His virgin mother and her husband Joseph. Do you ask,

Why such secrecy? Why, just think what would have happened if it had been noised abroad through the little town of Nazareth that the wife of just and devout Joseph had become a mother before her marriage, and that he, instead of immediately giving her a bill of divorce, had taken her home to him as his wife as if nothing wrong had happened! Where would have been the reputation for virtue of either of them from that time forward? And if, when He entered on public life and gave Himself forth as the long-promised and expected Messiah, what would have been the effect of a breath of suspicion about the manner of His birth? Would it not have been brought down upon Him as fatal to His claims? True, you may say, but what about His own family, could they be ignorant of such a peculiarity in His birth, if such there was? Well, first, this depends to some extent on whether they were born to Joseph by a previous marriage, or whether He was the offspring of both parents in the usual way. But waiving this, the thing was scarcely a subject for family talk; and if it was of any consequence that it should not be known outside, it is not very likely that they could entirely keep it to themselves, had the fact been communicated to them. Indeed, when we read in the fourth Gospel that "even His brethren did not believe on Him" (John vii. 5), and this too not long before His death, we can scarcely see how this could be if they were cognisant of the supernatural manner of His birth. I believe therefore that in the high wisdom that presided over every step in this matchless Life, it was ordered that only His virgin mother and His legal father should for a time know how "unto us a Child was born, unto us a Son was given, whose name should be called Wonderful, the Mighty God!"

Still, I confess that if this were all the answer I had to give to the objection founded on the silence on the subject of the Synoptic Gospels save at the outset of two

of them, it would not quite satisfy my own mind, much less any one troubled on the subject. But I think I can set the question at rest by what I have now to say.

It is a mistake, I think, to suppose that men's convictions of the sinlessness of our Lord should in the first instance be grounded on the manner of His birth, or any otherwise than on the patent facts of His life, and teaching, and works; so that when at length it came to be known in what manner He came into the world, they should see in this only the proper explanation, the all-sufficient key to what would otherwise have defied explanation—how He, who to outward appearance was like other sinful men, could throw out the challenge, “Which of you convicteth Me of sin?” (John viii. 45), and at the very close of His ministry say, “The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me” (xiv. 30). The Gospels are simply the records of those facts of His life which prove Him to be this. They were not written to prove this, or prove anything. They are not preaching histories, but an unvarnished relation of facts. And hence it is, that in narrating the events of His public life they never go back to the peculiar manner of His birth, as furnishing a basis for such a life.

So much for the Synoptic Gospels; but the fourth Gospel must be dealt with on another principle. For so usually does it comment upon the incidents it records, and the dialogues and discourses which it repeats (insomuch that it has been called the reflecting Gospel) that it would seem that there at least some hint of the miraculous conception, if such there was, and known to the writer, could hardly have failed to appear. To this it is, I think, a complete answer, that by the admission of the ablest and best critics of even the extreme wing of the negative school—by Hilgenfeld as well as Hengstenberg, by Baur no less than Luthardt, by Keim as well as Godet—that the Synoptic Gospels were known to the writer of the fourth Gospel;

and as he omits much of what had been before the public for years in the other Gospels, so He had no need to depend upon the Virgin as to the manner in which “the Word was made flesh.” Since, then, the manner of the fact was, ere he wrote, well known, it was enough for him to close his sublime Introduction with the august announcement, “The Word was made flesh . . . and we beheld His glory.” His object was different from that of the Synoptists. Theirs was simply to relate the facts; his was to show how the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father had been so unveiled in our flesh that he who had seen Him had seen the Father. I will even go further, and say that since he makes his Lord, in a subsequent chapter, say to Nicodemus, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh,” I cannot but feel (with Neander) that in saying, “The Word was made flesh,” this beloved disciple must have meant to indicate “that He was made *flesh*” in another way than in every other case, and even consciously leaned upon the Synoptic explanation of the manner of it.

Advancing now to another stage of the New Testament records—

2. *How is it*, we are asked, *that in all the proclamations of the Gospel message, there is not a single allusion to the miraculous conception?*

My answer to this is short:—it was no part of the message. Observe how very precisely the limits of that message are defined by the Apostle Peter, just before the Day of Pentecost, when the preaching of it began—“*beginning from the baptism of John unto the day that He was received up from us*” (Acts i. 22). Now if the message was not to begin till long after the event referred to—addressed, as it would have to have been to persons ill-prepared to receive it—the preachers would feel that there was offence enough in the cross itself, without obtruding on them another stumbling-block.

But the last difficulty may by some be thought the greatest of all.

3. Since the Apostolic Epistles contain, we must suppose, all necessary instruction in doctrine for the building up of the Churches in their most holy faith, how is it that even there we find no express mention of the miraculous conception?

Meyer holds this inexplicable if the event in question was a historical fact. Paul, he says, often speaks of God sending His Son, and of His human nature as sinless, yet nowhere does he write as if he presupposed anything miraculous in His birth. But Meyer himself admits, as Schleiermacher had done before him, that there must have been in that birth some mysterious operation upon the parents, else—being born like all other descendants of Adam—He must have come into the world with that hereditary taint of sin which, he rightly holds, would have vitiated His whole redemptive work. But about any such mysterious operation the Epistles are just as silent as about the miraculous conception. If, then, the absence of any allusion to such a conception as the first and third Gospels announce as a fact is fatal to its being a fact at all, is it not clear that the absence of any allusion to this “mysterious operation” is equally fatal to it? And what can be more fantastic—not to say unworthy of so exact an exegete as Meyer—than first to reject the testimony of two of the Gospels to the stupendous way in which the Son of God took flesh, and then—finding that the indispensable sinlessness of the Redeemer must have some explanation—to invent a solution of his own, which he neither pretends to explain nor can furnish a shred of evidence for believing? This is one of those freaks of criticism which critical students of the New Testament should be on their guard against. Attempting to steer between faith and unbelief usually creates more difficulties than it removes. Old views are rejected or explained away in the hope of propitiating those

who wince at them, while extreme positions on the other hand are eschewed because fatal to what they themselves count dear. The *mediation* (or compromise) theology (*Vermittelungs Theologie*) surrenders to the enemy this or that outwork of the Faith, as tending to encumber the defence of the citadel, in the hope of being better able, by a change of front, to hold the fort. But the outworks being the key of the position, those who surrender them render the breach of the wall, the irruption of the enemy, and the final capture of the citadel only a question of time. There is no real consisteney in this style of criticism. The supernaturalism of the New Testament I know, and anti-supernaturalism, pure and simple, I know, but who are ye? I may well ask, with the indignant demons of the Acts of the Apostles against the pretended ones.

As to the silence of the Epistles about the miraculous conception, I pray the reader to observe that even Meyer cannot deny that such statements as the following :—"Him who knew no sin He made to be sin for us"; "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin"; "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot unto God"; "the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot"—would be emptied of all their meaning if understood only of the *actions* of Christ, and there were no background of a sinless *nature*. And if the absence of such sinlessness of nature would be fatal to the redemption on which our hopes are built, are we to hang our belief of it on the poor thread of a *conjectural* sinlessness of birth, in place of the doubly attested way of it in the history itself?

It is a fact worthy of notice that the first attack against the purity of Christ's mother of which we read was that of Celsus, in the second century, in his bitter work against Christianity itself. That work is lost, but happily Origen, who in the third century replied to Celsus, and who indig-

nantly repels this charge against the Virgin, has reproduced the substance of all that Celsus had to say against Christianity. Of course, if even the Synoptic Gospels did not appear till about the middle of the second century, as the negative critics affirm, the charge against the purity of the Virgin could not have been sooner made. But those who believe that the Gospels were published before the end of the first century may naturally wonder why no trace of any such charge having been made by Jewish rejecters of Christ, even long after His death, to justify their unbelief, and that it should be left to a bitter heathen enemy to make it at a later period. I can only explain this by supposing that there had grown up so general a conviction that whatever might be thought of His claims, His life was such as never man before had led, and though unprepared to accept the testimony to the miraculous way of His birth, they could not bring themselves to vilify it. Nor was the subject reopened in any production worth notice from that time onwards—the whole Church for successive centuries adoring the mystery, until by giving to the blessed Virgin a place in men's regard which the New Testament does not give her, they came to pass on the wonder to herself, whereby heretical opinions were generated, tending to bring the whole subject into contempt.

The faith of the pre-Reformation Church in the true doctrine of the Incarnation was taken reverently up by the Reformers, and held by all orthodox Protestant Churches until, late in the last and early in the present century, rationalistic scepticism in Germany so overspread the Protestant Church there, that several of the most eminent men in the literary world—Schlegel and Count Stollberg for example—were fain to go over to the Church of Rome, that they might be able to breathe the air of a firm faith in the great verities of Divine Revelation; nor, I will venture to affirm, will there arise in any of our Churches the least

disposition to call in question the great cardinal truth of our Lord's supernatural birth, save in a tainted atmosphere—an atmosphere infected by a sceptical disposition to call in question everything within the range of revealed truth.

Perhaps it will be asked, How is this subject dealt with in the pulpit, when the Lord Jesus is held up before the people as the Lamb "without blemish and without spot," who being "in the likeness of sinful flesh" was yet "without spot"? In order to explain how He could throw out the challenge, "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" and say, at the end, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me":—do the preachers explain to them about the miraculous conception? No, assuredly they do not. Yet on the basis of a firm conviction in their Bible-taught people as well as themselves of the manner of His birth, they show an instinctive sense of the supreme delicacy of the subject, which will not suffer them to touch it with rude hands—an instinct shared in by those who hear them read the record of it in the lesson of the day, and, when preaching an Advent sermon, they simply refer to it. In fact, those who most profoundly believe and adore the mystery of it are those who least want it to be needlessly approached and gratuitously dwelt on.

This finishes what I have to say on this most sacred subject. I have shirked no feature of the subject which, so far as I am aware, has any claim to notice in the way of objection. And if I have succeeded in placing this doctrine on the firm basis of indisputable historical fact, I have done something more than refute groundless objections, however plausible and though advanced by critics of the greatest name: I have further shown how learning may be more than wasted—may be employed even to undermine the faith even of some of those critics themselves.

Since the substance of this paper was thought out and

put in type some years ago, I have noticed some observations on the subject of it in Dean Plumptre's valuable Boyle Lectures for 1866 (entitled *Christ and Christendom*), which seem to call for remark. They will be found in the Appendix, Note G, on "The History of the Infancy."

"The history [says the Dean] meets us already with regard to many thinkers, whom we are reluctant to condemn, and will probably be forced upon us by the progress of thought in many directions. How are we to judge of those who, while they receive the substance of the rest of the Gospel history, admit the Divine work and supernatural power of Jesus, and hold more or less clearly the central truth of the Nicene Creed, are yet unable to overcome the difficulties, critical and historical, which the history of the Nativity presents to them? The answer is, I believe, in silence, and in not judging. Maintaining, as we must maintain, that such men's thoughts do not come within the limits of any creed which Christendom has ever held, that they cannot rightly occupy a position as teachers in any Church which has inherited those creeds, it is yet right to remember that so far as the difficulties are critical and historical only, not the growth of a scoffing and impure spirit, they may leave men at least with the belief which thousands had in the first ages of the Church, when they heard the words of Christ or His apostles. There may be a confession that Jesus is 'the Christ, the Son of the living God,' a loving devotion to His will, a true obedience to His commands, even in the absence of power to receive the history which records how it was that the Son of God 'took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance.' Of those who make that confession truly we may well think as being 'not far from the kingdom of God,' and believe that if they seek to do His will they shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (pp. 366, 367).

On this I remark—(1) That when discussing views of revealed truth which "do not come within the limits of any creed which Christendom has ever held," it is scarcely fitting to speculate on how near their advocates may be to the kingdom of God. With such questions, I submit, we have nothing to do when examining their positions. To their own Master they stand or fall. For myself, I have not thought it either pertinent to my subject or proper in itself to say a word on such a point. But if we are to do so, let us not write so apologetically as to lead our readers

to think lightly of views which even this accomplished writer admits to be outside of any creed of Christendom. And all the less in those who, while holding and publicly advocating them, minister within Churches which hold as vital what they impugn, and in the public services of the Church repeat as their own faith what they deny and attempt to refute. (2) It is surprising that those who in our day impugn that most sacred truth which is the subject of this paper, should be held up as at least believing as much as "thousands did in the first ages of the Church, when they heard the words of Christ and His apostles." For it is one thing *not to know* a truth, never having had it proclaimed to them, and quite another thing to have had that truth before them all their lives in the Evangelical Records, and yet deliberately reject and try to disprove it. I have nothing to do with the state of mind which leads to that rejection, nor allow a thought about it to enter my own mind. What I affirm is, that there is no analogy between the innocent simplicity and child-like faith of the earliest Christians and the faith, in this ripe age of the New Testament and Christianity, of those who, it is admitted, cannot occupy a position as teachers in any Church which has inherited those creeds of Christendom, yet do occupy such a position. And viewing the matter in this light, I am not able to adopt the strain of the learned Dean.

DAVID BROWN.

*SURVEY OF RECENT NEW TESTAMENT
LITERATURE.*

TEXTUAL CRITICISM.—Those who make a study of the Text of the New Testament will have followed with interest the discussion of the Codex Amiatinus in the pages of the *Academy*, February to June, 1887. This discussion was conducted by Bishop Wordsworth, Dr. Hort, Dr. Sanday, and other authorities; and the result is, that instead of ascribing the MS. in question to the sixth century, as Tischendorf had done, it must now be dated between the years 690 and 716. It has also been ascertained that it was written by an Italian scribe in England, and was presented by Ceolfrid to St. Peter's.

Another very considerable addition to our knowledge of the Latin versions has been made by the publication of the third volume of the *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*. The title of this new part describes its contents, and runs as follows: “The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (q), now numbered Lat. 6224 in the Royal Library at Munich, with a fragment from St. John in the Hof. Bibliothek at Vienna (Cod. Lat. 502). Edited, with the aid of Tischendorf's Transcript (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury), by Henry J. White, M.A., of the Society of St. Andrew, Salisbury. With a facsimile.” (Oxford, Clarendon Press.) There is in this volume the usual minute and interesting description of the MS., as well as a brief history of it; but the chief part of the introduction is occupied by an endeavour to ascertain its relationship to other Old-Latin Texts. Dr. Hort (*New Testament*, ii. 79) places this MS. among the Italian class of MSS.; but the conclusion to which Mr. White has been led by his examination of it is rather that “if it be Italian in its readings, it is European in its renderings.” He finds by actual comparison that it resembles the European MS. (b) or Veronensis more closely than any other, but that it cannot be classed with any one definite branch of the Old-Latin family. Mr. White is still prosecuting his inquiries into the character of this MS., and labour sustained by such enthusiasm and directed by scholarship so sound cannot fail to win some permanent results.

With students of the Text few names, if any, are in better

repute than that of Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D. This writer has trained us to expect in everything he signs the brightest intelligence, using as its instrument a sound and trained scholarship. Unfortunately much of what he prints never reaches this country. In the New York *Independent* of January 17th and January 26th he gives a very admirable *résumé* of New Testament Textual Criticism in 1887; and in the *Journal of the Exegetical Society* he discusses four different passages in the first chapter of 2 Corinthians. These brief discussions should not be lost sight of by students of the New Testament.

INTRODUCTION AND EXEGESIS.—To English literature on the New Testament there has not been added during the past winter much that is of first-rate importance. Probably those who have been reading what has appeared will be of opinion that no more honest and thorough piece of work has come into their hands than the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospel according to St. John* by Dr. Reynolds, President of Cheshunt College. This introduction is prefixed to the first volume devoted to the fourth gospel in the *Pulpit Commentary*, and should not be lost to view in that ponderous work. Much has been written on this gospel, and the best equipped critics have contributed their volumes to the solution of the difficulties which surround it. In no introduction is there a more intelligent and impartial statement of the case for and against the authenticity of the gospel than in this, and in none are there more reasonable pleadings in favour of the Johannine authorship. Fairness and fulness characterize Dr. Reynolds' treatment of the subject. The objections are thoroughly appreciated and frankly stated. There is no pooh-poohing or unintelligent minimizing of intelligent criticism. Novel arguments in connexion with this well-worn theme will not be expected. At the same time there is a freshness in their statement which tells of perfect assimilation by the mind of the writer, and on some points new light is thrown. On p. exxiii., for example, some considerable fragments are removed from that most serious stumbling-block to some students of the gospel—the likeness of the style of the evangelist to that of Jesus. The evidence here adduced in favour of the difference between these styles is valid, and must be weighed against the undoubted similarities. On the whole, no writer has more adequately dealt with the various difficulties which beset the fourth gospel, although individual points may receive in other introduc-

tions a somewhat fuller attention. [On p. clxi. the name of Holtzmann has slipped in where the name of Bleek is intended.]

Another volume which may contribute to the more intelligent perusal of the New Testament is Dr. Marvin R. Vincent's *Word-Studies in the New Testament*. (Messrs. James Nisbet & Co.) This well-printed and handsome book of 820 pages overtakes only the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, and is to be followed by a second volume completing the work. The design of the book is thus explained by the author: "Taking a position midway between the exegetical commentary and the lexicon and grammar, it aims to put the reader of the English Bible nearer to the standpoint of the Greek scholar, by opening to him the native force of the separate words of the New Testament in their lexical sense, their etymology, their history, their inflection, and the peculiarities of their usage by different evangelists and apostles." This is a legitimate or even laudable object. Many readers of the New Testament desire to be placed more on a level with those who read Greek, and they crave a more exact knowledge of the thought of the writers than a translation can possibly afford. Singularly unlike a translation as our Authorized Version is, the thought will again and again occur to the reader of it that he is not in the closest possible contact with the mind of the writers. Such readers Dr. Vincent aims at satisfying. And this design he has carried out with extraordinary patience and a large measure of success. Without resorting to lexicon or commentary, the English reader who keeps Dr. Vincent's volume open before him will generally find some remark which gives additional significance and interest to the text. Sometimes indeed these "word-studies" have no bearing on the passage, and lend no added significance to it. They are true but irrelevant. For example, it is no doubt an interesting fact that *ψηφίζειν*, *to count*, is derived from *ψῆφος*, *a pebble*, as *calculate* is derived from *calculus*: but not to mention that this is very elementary instruction, it is also out of place in the connexion in which Dr. Vincent introduces it, as it sheds not a single candle's glimmer of light upon the passage. There are too many instances of such irrelevancies. A word-student so competent as Dr. Vincent should be aware that the popular usage of a word often differs as much from its etymological significance as the flying bird differs from the motionless egg. The volume is brightened

by elucidations culled from Dante, Plato, and other sources. Sufficiently well-informed introductions are prefixed to the several books, and serviceable lists are given of the words peculiar to each writer.

Another aid to the study of the New Testament has been provided for those who have not received a classical education by the Rev. Edward Miller, M.A., Rector of Bucknell, who has published, in compliance with a request of the Clarendon Press delegates, a *Greek Testament Primer*. This primer consists of two parts, the first being an easy grammar, the second a reading book. The grammar necessarily follows the usual order, and even uses the familiar paradigms, its distinctiveness consisting in its drawing illustrative examples of syntax from the New Testament, and generally confining itself both in accidence and syntax to words which are used by New Testament writers. The "Reading Primer," which occupies about half of the small volume, is admirably graduated, leading the scholar forward from the simplest expressions to long passages from Paul's Epistles and the Sermon on the Mount. Any one who masters the 130 pages of this primer will have a very satisfactory foundation for further attainments, and will already be able to read with ease the Greek of the New Testament. Mr. Miller has done his work with spirit, intelligence, and accuracy; and in this, as in so many other instances, the delegates of the Clarendon Press are to be congratulated on their choice of a writer, as well as on the attractive appearance and perfect typography exhibited in all they issue.

It should further be recorded that Weiss' *Introduction to the New Testament* is in process of translation, and that the first volume has already appeared in Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's Foreign Biblical Library. Holtzmann's *Einleitung* is no doubt a fuller repertory of opinion, but as a thoroughly complete and satisfactory introduction from the point of view of a fairly conservative criticism, no book can compete with Weiss'. It is very independent, and in some of his judgments the author cannot expect to be followed; but it is throughout full of knowledge, of sense, and of vigor. The translation, while it might here and there admit improvement, has many merits.

EXPOSITION.—Among expository, as distinguished from exegetical works, the first place is due to the two volumes with which Mr. Nicoll inauguates his Expositor's Bible. These volumes are Dean

Chadwick's *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, and Dr. Alexander Maelaren's *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians and Philemon*, both published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. These are expositions of the highest order. With Dean Chadwick many readers will make their first acquaintance in his present volume, and will be surprised and a little aggrieved that a writer with so much that is distinctive in his thought and in his style should have hitherto been unknown to them. Without a doubt, his present publication will incite his readers to make acquaintance with his previous writings. Naturally one takes up an exposition of a gospel with languid indifference. We know what to expect; it has all been said a hundred times already. Consequently, it is with unusual delight that Dean Chadwick's readers, even in the first pages, become aware that they are in the company of a thoroughly original writer, who repeats nothing, echoes nothing, imitates no one. It is with a feeling of thankfulness his readers follow him from passage to passage of the gospel, finding new truth in familiar words and incidents; and, unable to confine themselves to the limits they had set for their day's reading, are lured on to trespass on to-morrow's portion. There is every quality here that is desirable in an expositor—reverence for his text, sufficient information about it, sympathetic insight, and keen observation of men and manners. Equally successful in opening up the significance of the text, and in applying it to present conditions of life, Dean Chadwick has given us an admirable specimen of what an Expositor's Bible should be.

Of Dr. Maelaren's volume less need be said, both because his style of work is perfectly well known and thoroughly appreciated, and also because readers of this magazine have had opportunity of judging for themselves of the merits of his present volume. Suffice it to say, that in nothing Dr. Maelaren has written is there more of beauty, of spiritual insight, or of brilliant elucidation of Scripture. Indeed, Dr. Maelaren is here at his best. The results of study and thought are presented in an intelligible and attractive form, and the practical aspects of his subject, which he never overlooks or misses, are brought out with explicit application to the details of common life, but never without dignity, and never without impressiveness. Behind all that this great preacher utters we are conscious of an earnest and sympathetic spirit as well as a cultured and efficient intellect. As a practical and yet thorough

and textual exposition of these Epistles Dr. Maclaren's volume will for a long time to come hold the field.

Among kindred volumes may be mentioned *Studies in the Life and Character of St. Peter*, by the Rev. H. A. Birks, M.A.; also published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. Mr. Birks takes up the leading incidents in the life of the Apostle as they are recorded in the Gospels and Acts, and expounds them. In form these expositions are such as might be addressed to a congregation. They are written in a bright and animated style, and contain more than the average amount of information. Some care has been spent upon them, and the results of this care appear in a fresh and instructive treatment of the familiar passages. If not a very forcible or thrilling book, it is pleasing and not without value. The chapter on "St. Peter's Life and Letters" is not convincing.—Messrs. James Nisbet & Co. send us a volume which belongs to the same class of literature. It is *The First Letter of Paul the Apostle to Timothy*, by Alfred Rowland, LL.B., B.A. It contains a popular commentary and forty sermonettes, which is Mr. Rowland's euphemism for the more familiar if less elegant "skeletons." The volume has all the appearance of being a strayed contribution to the *Pulpit Commentary*. Its form and its workmanship both suggest the requirements of that too popular work. The homilies are intended to help teachers of religion "in the pulpit, in the class, or in the home." And though the book as a whole cannot be called suggestive, there are suggestive things in it. The reader will almost inevitably be reminded of Goldsmith's rule for gaining reputation as a critic, and say to himself, This book would have been much better, if the writer had taken more pains.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.—Rather out of date we have received a work in the department of Biblical Theology too important to be omitted. It is *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, by Vincent Henry Stanton, M.A. (T. & T. Clark.) The publication of this weighty and well-considered volume is due to Mr. Stanton's having been appointed Hulsean Lecturer for 1879. And it may without any hesitation be affirmed that of late years no more instructive theological work has appeared, and none which has a more decisive bearing on the main issue between Christianity and scepticism. Mr. Stanton clearly perceives what is required to give the results of inquiry a scientific value, and to make conclusions final. He has set about his work in a right spirit, with serious-

ness of mind and complete equipment. In his examination of the Jewish literature connected with his subject, he has of course had many pioneers; but he does not base his argument on second-hand information, and his survey of the messianic expectation at the time of Christ will be found to include ideas that are novel. After ascertaining how the messianic idea arose, and what its elements were in the times preceding the birth of Jesus, he proceeds to investigate the attitude of Jesus towards messianic belief; and no one can read what he has to say of the Christian transformation of the idea of the Messiah and of the kingdom of God, without feeling that a flood of light is let in upon the New Testament. This book will certainly become the standard book on the subject.

From Messrs. Williams & Norgate we receive, too late for the examination it evidently deserves, Mr. James Stuart's *Principles of Christianity*. As a critic of the received theology, Mr. Stuart is acute and often successful, but in constructing a theology of his own he fails more lamentably than his predecessors. We may adapt Matthew Arnold's maxim, and say that a critic should abstain from construction. The failure of the constructive part of the work will discredit what is sound in the critical part.

SERMONS.—Of sermons there has been the usual abundant crop, and it is of average quality. Dr. Salmon's volume entitled *Gnosticism and Agnosticism, and other Sermons* (Macmillan & Co.) is valuable, and is characterized by the author's well-known learning, flexibility of intellect, and acuteness of perception. Several of the sermons are important, and several contain new ideas. The subjects are various; theological, ethical, experimental, and social. They are all worthy of the preacher's great and growing reputation, and although not oratorical they are at once persuasive and substantial.—From the same publishing house we have received *Wellington College Sermons*, by E. C. Wickham, M.A. The subjects handled by Mr. Wickham in these sermons evince a real consideration of the actual temptations and wants of the public school boy; and these subjects are treated in a perfectly lucid and straightforward manner. The earnest and manifestly sincere and well-grounded appeals which abound in these sermons cannot have failed to touch many consciences; and it is most satisfactory to know that in the great public schools of the country such influences as are embodied in these sermons are brought to bear on the

scholars. It may be added that Mr. Wickham's style is a model of chaste and expressive English.—It is with pleasure the many admirers and disciples of Mr. Newman Smyth will receive a new selection of his sermons under the significant title, *Christian Facts and Forces.* (T. Fisher Unwin.) This volume is much more satisfactory than its predecessor, and abounds in passages of great vigour and incisiveness. The sermons on "The Honesty of Jesus," "Misunderstanding Christ," and "A Study of the Atonement," should be read by all. This is the kind of preaching that will commend the religion of Christ to serious men by showing them what it really is. Such volumes as this have immeasurable influence for good.—The friends of the late Rev. Frank Mudie, of Arbroath, have published, through Messrs. Maclehose & Sons, of Glasgow, a volume of his sermons, entitled *Bible Truths and Bible Characters.* In doing so they have been well advised. It would have been a pity had such sermons been lost. They are the utterances of a thoroughly sane, well-balanced, and mature mind. They may perhaps best be characterized as wise; wise both with the wisdom that results from genial and large-hearted observation of human life, and with that which comes to those who habitually live in the presence of realities unseen as well as seen. Considering that these sermons were not prepared for publication, but are merely specimens of Mr. Mudie's habitual work, they reveal a standard of preparation for the pulpit which it would be very pleasant but quite impossible to believe common. The preachers of Scotland might indeed be proud if this volume could be accepted as representative of their ordinary work.—Among sermons may be reckoned the Rev. John W. Diggle's *True Religion.* (David Stott.) The volume contains "a series of short essays touching the intimate relation of religion to some matters of common life." Mr. Diggle is a man by himself, and if the reader does not expect too much from him, he will get a great deal. Brisk and wideawake he at all times is. He is well read, and can make good use of his reading, which is not so common. He speaks of things that are interesting to every one, and he has always an opinion of his own to offer, and something to say for it. He is an agreeable companion, and leaves the mind simmering, if not boiling over. If his next book is as much in advance of his present volume as this is in advance of his previous one, it will be a very good book indeed.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Among books which belong rather to apologetic

than to expository literature the first place must be given to Dr. Martinean's *A Study of Religion, its Sources and Contents*. At present this great work can only be mentioned. Those who value Dr. Martinean's *Types of Ethical Theory* have looked for the appearance of this study of religion with some eagerness, and they will not be disappointed. The veteran apologist writes at his own level, and no doubt we have here the sifted and repeatedly tested conclusions of his massive and disciplined intellect. The book is published by the Clarendon Press.—From Messrs. T. & T. Clark we have received Bernhard Pünjer's *History of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion from the Reformation to Kant*, translated by W. Hastie, B.D. This work, proceeding from a man who died in his thirty-fifth year, is a marvel of erudition and maturity of judgment, and passes even German industry and learning. Undoubtedly careful and able, it will be found an admirable supplement to Pfleiderer's work on the same subject, and no one who is interested in the development of thought in connexion with the Christian religion will fail to consult it. Pünjer writes as lucidly as Pfleiderer himself, and conveys the impression of being even less biased than that very fair writer. It will be a mistake if laymen leave this volume to professed theologians, as there is nothing in it to repel non-professional readers, but, on the contrary, much to attract and much to repay study. Is it foolish to express the hope that the theologians who feel in honour bound to purchase this volume will not shelve it unread, and that some laymen may devote to it the Sunday evenings of a few months? It may without hesitation be affirmed that in twenty pages of this admirably translated volume there is more mental nutriment than in twenty volumes of ordinary religious literature.—Dorner's *System of Christian Ethics* was published after the distinguished author's death, and is now issued by Messrs. Clark in an English dress. The translation has been made by Prof. Mead and Rev. R. T. Cunningham. It is a book very difficult to characterize. Dr. Dorner was a very great theologian, learned, profound, and speculative. But he was ponderous. The student will find ideas and stimulus in his writings; the mere reader is quite likely to find nothing. He is not one of the universal men who appeals to every one, but rather attracts those who have some natural mental affinity with him. The present work is comprehensive, thorough, and instructive, but it is not easy reading. Kept for reference, it

will generally utter a guiding voice when consulted, but it may disappoint. Some chapters seem quickened by true originality of thought, others are original only in the obscure and roundabout method of arriving at a decision. It is a book that a few will swear by, while the majority will leave it unread.—Two volumes issued by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. may be recommended to readers of apologetic literature. These are *Man's Knowledge of Man and of God*, by Richard Travers Smith, D.D.; and *From Within*, by George Harwood, M.A. These volumes bear some resemblance to one another. Both writers argue from the personality of which we are conscious within to a supreme personality without. In both cases the argument is conducted with great skill and in an admirable spirit. Dr. Smith's argument leaves upon the mind the impression that there is a very high degree of probability in the idea that a personal God exists. Mr. Harwood is more entertaining and less cautious; but if it cannot be said that his argumentation is throughout valid, it must be said that he makes some capital points, and agreeably stimulates the mind. Of either essay it is safe to assert that no one will grudge the time spent on reading it.—From Messrs. Clark we receive *The Reign of Causality*, under which title Dr. Robert Watts, of Belfast, groups some old papers and reviews, together with some new matter.—To another volume, which consists chiefly of material already published in a more fugitive form, attention may be more cordially called. Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, in collecting and reprinting his *Essays on Some of the Modern Guides of English Thought in Matters of Faith* (Macmillan & Co.), has anticipated the desire of many students of literature and of religion. Few if any guides of English thought in such matters are more trusted than Mr. Hutton himself, and many words of his which will never be reprinted have found a permanent form in the more intelligent and firmly based faith of men who have learned from him so to admit the growing light as to clarify and mature, rather than to wither and kill their belief in things spiritual. The title which Mr. Hutton has chosen for his studies is perhaps rather large. We read the names of those whose influence he expounds and criticises—Thomas Carlyle, Cardinal Newman, Matthew Arnold, George Eliot, Frederick Denison Maurice; and we ask, Where are the philosophers? where are the Germans? where are Emerson, Browning, Spencer, and Huxley? Really it is some English guides of modern thought

that Mr. Hutton discusses, and of these only the men who have most profoundly influenced himself. Cardinal Newman is a great historic figure and a helpful spiritual teacher, but has he set in motion any ideas which will be permanently embodied in the thought of the English people? But let us not quarrel with Mr. Hutton's selection, but congratulate ourselves on receiving his carefully formed judgments on those whose influence has day by day been seen and weighed by himself throughout his literary career. If the pages devoted to Carlyle's style be omitted, it may safely be said that it would be impossible to pack more just and instructive criticism of that great writer into the same space. What is here said needed to be said; and it is said finally. Especially conclusive are the few pages in which the untenability of Carlyle's religious position is exposed. The same may be said of the long and careful study of George Eliot. In common with many others, Mr. Hutton seems always to have missed the significance of Matthew Arnold's teaching on religion, and in consequence much of his criticism seems irrelevant or at any rate not decisive. The fact that so many thoughtful minds have hailed Matthew Arnold as their prophet is enough to show that he has uttered what was being blindly groped after as the complement of previous and more orthodox teaching. Let us acknowledge that he has justly rebuked, though in unmeasured terms and to his own hurt, the presumption of theological confidence, and having done so in sincerity we shall be prepared to build a truer theology and a more unassailable faith. Like Dante's Virgil, Matthew Arnold has carried a lantern behind his back, guiding those who come after him, but shedding no ray into the darkness that hangs over his own path. All Mr. Hutton's essays will be relished for their frank and quick recognition of merit, their clear exposure of error, their expertness and penetration and thoughtfulness.—On its first appearance attention was called in these pages to the Rev. Clement Poynder's little book on the holy communion entitled *The Lord's Body*. (Simpkin, Marshall & Co.) It has now reached a third edition, and the more widely it is known the better. It forcibly enunciates truths which are too often overlooked. The same author has also written an excellent little tract, *Redemption, What is it from? How is it Effect ed?* (Bristol, Chilcot) in which there is more light than in many books a hundred times its size.

Yet another volume partly composed of reprinted articles is sent

by Messrs. Nisbet & Co. It is *Gospels of Yesterday*. *Drummond, Spencer, Arnold*. By Robert A. Watson, M.A. That these critiques are clever and smartly written no one who reads them will find it possible to deny. And yet with his acuteness and faculty for witty and forcible writing, Mr. Watson must give us better work than we have in the present volume. A light and cleverly handled gunboat may sail round and round an ironclad and pepper her severely, knocking a hole here and there, and making a wreck of the deck-fittings, but after all she has to haul off and leave the heavier vessel to pursue its way. Mr. Watson's criticism is not of contemptible calibre, but it is too scattered to sink the objects of his attack. It is of the kind which may be called sterile criticism. He does not seek to find out the strength of the writings he criticises, but only to expose and destroy their weaknesses. From such criticism small help is derived. We do not wish to throw aside Drummond, Spence, and Arnold until we have sucked out of them the truth which gives them vitality. Mr. Watson in no case helps us to do so. From this point of view his paper on Arnold is especially disappointing. Under the title which he gives it, "The Gospel of Nature," important and far-reaching questions fail to be discussed, but of these no hint is given. His treatment of Spence is more thorough, and though some of his smartest hits seem irrelevant, there is no question that he scores point after point. Every one who relishes clever writing and what may be called unsympathetic if not hostile criticism will find much enjoyment in a volume which is acute, piquant, sustained, and telling; and certainly there is enough in it to give us pause before accepting any of the gospels of yesterday. Our only regret is—and perhaps it is a foolish one—that with the sound and careful thinking and vigorous style which Mr. Watson here shows, he has not given us a book as original as Arnold's, as influential as Spencer's, as fascinating as Drummond's.

MARCUS DODS.

THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA.

THE publication of the *Speaker's Commentary* forms a landmark in the history of religious thought in England. It would be interesting to trace the circumstances in which the undertaking originated; to indicate the changes of view caused by the growth of opinion which has occurred during the quarter of a century since the work was first planned; and to estimate the kind and degree of influence which the *Commentary* has exercised. All this lies outside my subject, though I hope that it will be treated by some abler and more competent pen. But the completion of the task by the recent publication of the "Commentary on the Apocrypha" furnishes an opportunity for taking a rapid glance at the curious and important body of literature of which a new key has now been placed in the hands of English students. I have no intention of attempting any review of the work, or of pointing out the many merits and occasional inequalities of the different contributors. I wish rather to furnish such general and introductory considerations as may perhaps induce some readers to turn with deepened interest to the mass of exegetical material which, in these two learned and valuable volumes, is now placed conveniently within their reach. But in order to do this within the narrow limits of a single paper I must rigidly exclude all collateral topics.

The historical value of the *Apocrypha* can hardly be exaggerated. From the books which are classed together under that name we derive our chief information, both direct and indirect, respecting the events and influences

which affected four centuries of the history of the chosen people. When the voice of genuine prophecy falls silent with the last words of Malachi, we have not a word more of canonical Scripture to explain the immense change of practice and opinion which we find firmly established in the days of our Lord. But there is no discontinuity in history. If St. Augustine was right in the thought which predominates throughout his *De Civitate Dei*; if Orosius, in the opening words of his *Epitome*, correctly states the view of the great African Father in the words, “Divinā Providentiā agitur mundus et homo”; if Vico truly describes history as “a civil theology of the Divine Providence,”—then it would be absurd to suppose that the hand of God was not felt as distinctly as at other times through the wheelwork of human events during those four hundred years. The spirit of man which is the candle of the Lord did not cease to shed some light on the problems of life for that long interspace between the death of Malachi and the angel songs which heralded the Saviour’s birth.

The events of that history have been narrated by Josephus, and in modern times recapitulated with much learning and candour by Dean Prideaux in his *Old and New Testament Connected*; by the Roman Catholic Dr. Jahn in his *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*; by Ewald in his *History of Israel*; by the Jewish historians, Grätz, Jost, Herzfeld, and others. They have attracted the attention of all writers who desired to understand the tone of thought which we find reflected in the Gospels, and which issued in one direction in the crucifixion of the Lord of glory, and in another in the spread of the Christian faith. The *praeparatio evangelica* was going on throughout these centuries alike in the Jewish and Pagan world.

The state of things which prevailed at the dawn of the Christian era was the result of three dominant influences: of which two were purely foreign, and the other was an

indigenous development due to the pressure of surrounding circumstances and to the powerful impress which the Jewish nation received from the character of one memorable reformer. Those three influences were, (1) Parsism ; (2) Hellenism ; and (3), if I may be allowed to borrow the word, Scribism.

1. God teaches nations, as He teaches individuals, by their mutual intercourse. The bigoted and narrow notion, that there was no such thing as ethnic inspiration, and that during the old dispensation God confined His gifts and His teaching to the Jewish people, has now, it is to be hoped, been entirely abandoned. The recent science of comparative religion has brought home to us in their full significance the golden words of St. Paul at Athens, that God “made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation ; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us : for in Him we live, and move, and have our being.” St. Paul endorsed the sentiment of Aratus, that we are also His offspring ; and thus there is nothing to shock us in the fact that certain doctrines of Judaism, and those of great importance, were not indeed exclusively learnt or borrowed from the PERSIANS during the Babylonian exile, but yet were considerably developed by the intercourse of the Hebrews with that vigorous Aryan nation. The great doctrine of the Unity of God was the choicest possession of the Semitic races ; yet it had never saved the Jews from those incessant apostasies into all kinds of idolatrous nature-worship which their history records. They returned from the Exile cured for ever of that fatal tendency of which the Exile itself had been the retributive consequence. If their Monotheism had been deepened by reaction, as they became eye-witnesses of the monstrous aberrations prevalent among Assyrians and

Babylonians, it had been also strengthened by the contrast of those idolatries with the purer fire-worship of the race of Cyrus. Similarly it is certain that, in spite of the mysterious silence of Moses, the Jews were not without some hope of immortality; but as that belief grows purer and more definite in the course of their annals, so undoubtedly it acquired new force from the intercourse of Jews with the most gifted of their foreign conquerors. The belief in one personal Satan seems also to have become more vivid among them from their familiarity with the Persian conception of Ahriman; and both the angelology and demonology of the chosen people acquired fresh prominence and variety during the seventy years' captivity.¹ In none of these instances can it be asserted that the doctrines in question were of entirely foreign origin; but since we find the conceptions more active and more developed after the Exile, it seems certain that they were strengthened by extraneous influences. Truth—even religious truth—had never been confined to the offspring of Abraham. Other nations beside Judæa had angels and heavenly princes and watchers of their own. The practices as well as the doctrines of the later Jews acquired force and distinctness from their eyewitness of foreign religions. The existing rules about clean and unclean meats gained cogency from their observance by the Parsees; and the growth of synagogues—an event of capital importance—was greatly stimulated by the necessity for such institutions among the scattered captives as well as by the daily observation of a worship of which the sacred ceremonies were not tied down to a single temple.

2. The powerful influence exercised over the East by the HELLENIC races did not begin till a century later. It was the most permanent result of the conquests of Alexander the Great. Had he never done anything but found Alexandria, we should still have had to reckon him among the

¹ See Dan. x. 13-21, xi. 1; Zech. iii. 1-9, iv. 10, etc.

number of those who have most deeply affected the fortunes of the human race. Like the seething of grapes in a vine-cluster, the various nationalities represented by the motley groups which thronged the streets of that remarkable city caused, by their mutual contact, an interpenetration of opinion which created a new epoch in philosophy and religion. The latest historical personage mentioned in the Old Testament is Jaddua the high priest (*Neh. xii. 11*),¹ who, according to the Jewish legend, met Alexander at Sapha in b.c. 332, and received his homage—as Acholius received that of Theodosius, and Paulinus that of Edwin of Deira,—because he recognised in the High Priest a figure which he had already seen in vision.² Jaddua induced the youthful hero not only to avert his wrath from Jerusalem, but even to bestow privileges and immunities upon its inhabitants. The conqueror of Tyre found no difficulty in persuading a colony of Jews to settle in his new Egyptian city. He died b.c. 323, and in 320 Ptolemy Lagi captured Jerusalem on a Sabbath day, and carried to Egypt a multitude of Jews. From this time till the beginning of Roman domination, Judaea was reduced to an insignificant subdivision of a Greek empire, and became the battleground of rival Greek dynasties—the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. It was left to the caprice and ambition of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV.,—Epiphanes, “the Illustrious,” or, as his enemies loved to call him, Epimanes, the “Frantic,”³—to arouse the Jews, in b.c. 167, to a fierce revolt. This rebellion called forth a succession of hero priests and princes, whose efforts ended, in b.c. 143, in the brief establishment of Jewish independence. Antiochus endeavoured to force them to the worship of Greek gods by savage persecution,

¹ I exclude all consideration of the difficulties in *1 Chron. iii. 21-24*, where the LXX. reading would bring down the date to b.c. 225.

² Josephus: *Ant. xi. 8, § 5.*

³ Dan. xi. 21: *וְבָזֵן*, “a vile person.”

but he only kindled in their hearts a flame of holy zeal and splendid patriotism. It was this rude awakening which caused an outburst of national literature and vigorous exertion. Whatever view may be taken of the Book of Daniel—and in spite of Dr. Pusey's arguments, it is strange that any one can still hold that the whole book, as we possess it, was written before B.C. 533—we see in Daniel xi., not only a minute description (as unlike the spirit of Hebrew prophecy as can well be conceived) of events which occurred during this entire epoch, but we can also judge what were the events which made the deepest impression on the imagination of the Jews themselves.

Hellenism worked upon the minds of the Jews in many ways, and Judaism in its turn affected the views of the Greeks. The Septuagint translation became, as has well been said, “the first great Apostle of the Gentiles”; and there, as in Josephus, we can trace the dislike of the anthropomorphism and primitive simplicity of parts of the Old Testament, which shows that the Jews were very sensitive to the criticism of cultivated heathens. Philo and the great Alexandrian school of thought and exegesis both Jewish and Christian, of which he was almost the founder and certainly the ablest representative, permanently affected the whole course of biblical interpretation by borrowing from Greek philosophy that allegorical method, of which the Stoics had set them the example in spiritualising the poems of Homer. The influence of Greek philosophic systems is distinctly traceable in the Book of Wisdom. From the days of the founding of Alexandria, when the Jews began gradually to learn that

“All wisdom is not hid in Moses' law,
The Pentateuch, and what the prophets wrote
The Gentiles also know and write and teach
To admiration, led by Nature's light,”—

the waters of the Ilyssus begin to mingle with the affluents

of the Jordan. The attempt indeed to Hellenise the *practices* of Judaism and the general *form* of its literature failed ignominiously. The high priests Jason and Menelas, who tried to introduce gymnasias into Palestine, and to fit their countrymen for gymnopaedic contests by obliterating the seal of the national covenant,¹ were execrated by all religious patriots, and Jason earned for himself the title of that “ungodly wretch and no high priest.”² Nor was the attempt to write Jewish dramas in Greek iambics, and Jewish epics in Greek hexameters any more successful. Such literature could only be at the best a sickly exotic. Like a dead and rootless flower it perished of inanition at an early stage. It has only left us the shadows of names: Philo the elder, who wrote an epic on Jerusalem; Ezekiel, the author of a Greek drama on the Exodus; Theodotus, who related in verse the story of Dinah and Shechem. The *tallith* of Shem could not thus be united with the *pallium* of Japheth. But in other ways there was an interchange of thought between the races. The characteristics of Jewish nationality were too stubbornly tenacious to be altogether deracinated, but they received ingrafted shoots which had life and beauty of their own. Henceforth the ancient terebinth which had murmured over the cradle of Isaac is not only adorned externally, like the golden platanus of Xerxes, with Persian jewels and mantles, but it is also budded with Hellenic graffs, and brings forth new fruit,

“Miraturque novas frondes, et non sua poma.”

3. But the third and indigenous influence which radically affected the heart and soul of Jewish faith, and which has been called *Scribism*, dates its origin from the remarkable

¹ 1 Macc. i. 11–15, 41–61; 2 Macc. iv. 10–15; Jos., Ant. xii. 5, § 1; מִשְׁאָכִים;

1 Cor. vii. 18, ἐπισπασμός; Ewald, *Hist. of Isr.* v. 268–271, etc.

² 2 Macc. iv. 13.

personality of Ezra, the first great Scribe. Ezra was the founder of Judaism in the more modern sense of the term, with its oral law, its liturgical forms, its long succession of Sopherim, Chakhamim, Tanaim, and other rabbinic schools; and ultimately with its Targums, Mishna, Midrashim, and Talmud. Ezra, so far as he was the founder of the legalistic spirit, deserved his title of "a second Moses"; but only in the very inferior sense that the veneration for tradition, with its endless micrology and its deification of traditions and observances, had its roots in the movement which he inaugurated, and professed to be based upon the Mosaic law. From the labours of the so-called Great Synagogue began in two different directions the intellectual impulses, which resulted in the two great branches of rabbinic activity, the Halakha and the Haggada;—the nature of which is now sufficiently known to need no further explanation to readers of *THE EXPOSITOR*.

There is nothing in the Apocrypha which is definitely marked by the spirit of Rabbinism in its minuter features. The distinctive elements of the Halakha were of later development, although it is true that Epiphanius speaks of a Mishna ($\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{e}\rho\omega\sigma\varsigma$) of the Hasmonæans. The full Halakha was not committed to writing till the days of Akiba at the earliest. But the deification of the law, and the rigid insistence upon observances, which mark the teaching of most of the Apocryphal books, show the general stream of tendency. In several of the treatises of the Apocrypha we have some of the earlier and better specimens of the Haggadic fiction, which assumed such immense and monstrous forms in the Gemara and the Midrashim. Nor is it without significance that the name "Judaism" makes its appearance for the first time in the Second Book of Maccabees.¹

The whole mass of literature which we call Apocryphal,

¹ 2 Macc. ii. 21, viii. 1, xiv. 38 (comp. Gal. i. 13).

and of which only a part has ever been admitted into proximity with our sacred Scriptures, sprang up during the centuries in which these three influences of Parsism, Hellenism, and Scribism had been at work. For fully a century and a half of that epoch we have no Jewish literature, except such as may be represented by the very earliest fragments of any translations of the Bible into Greek. The Septuagint itself in its oldest portions—the version of the Pentateuch—is hardly of earlier origin than b.c. 277. The letter of Aristeas is a notorious forgery. The fragments of Aristobulus are perhaps genuine, but are not earlier than b.c. 160. The earliest of the books in our present Apocrypha are perhaps some of the additions to the Book of Daniel, and probably they do not go back further than b.c. 167. If Ewald's theory be right, the Book of Baruch, in part at least, is considerably earlier than this date; but his view is disputed and is highly disputable.

The name Apocrypha corresponds to the Hebrew **ספרים נזויים**, “hidden books,” and **ספרים חיצוניים**, “books of outsiders.” These non-biblical writings fall under the classes of (1) Those incorporated with the Bible by the LXX; (2) Those imbedded in the oldest portions of the Talmud and Midrashim; and (3) Those which are of independent origin. With the two latter divisions we are here entirely unconcerned. Those of the first division may be classed under various heads. They have been sometimes classified as Historic, Didactic, and Prophetic. There have also been attempts to divide them into Palestinian and Hellenic, according as they were originally written in Hebrew (Aramaic) or in Greek; or as they show the traces of opinion prevailingly Pharisaic or Alexandrian. The lines of division are however too obscure and interchangeable to enable us to rely on such a division.

They may perhaps be conveniently arranged as follows:
HISTORIC. The first Book of Maccabees.

PARTIALLY HISTORIC. The Second Book of Maccabees.

PARENTHETIC FICTION. The Books of Judith and Tobit.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC FICTION. Bel and the Dragon ; the Story of Susanna.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC AND UNHISTORIC COMPLETIONS OF SCRIPTURE BOOKS. The First Book of Esdras ; the Rest of Esther ; the Book of Baruch ; the Epistle of Jeremy ; the Song of the Three Children ; the Prayer of Manasses.

APOCALYPTIC. The Second Book of Esdras.

SAPIENTIAL. The Books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom.

Perhaps I shall best fulfil the task assigned to me, if I glance swiftly at the contents and characteristics of each book, and then conclude with a few words on the Apocryphal literature as a whole. For it is my object, as far as possible, to "orientate" the reader (if I may adopt a convenient French phrase) as to the general significance of the Apocrypha, which he may now study with exceptional advantage under the guidance afforded to him by the new commentary.

1. HISTORIC.—Of all the books of the Apocrypha the *First Book of the Maccabees* is perhaps the most valuable. It is a serious and trustworthy history of forty memorable years (B.C. 175–135) in Jewish history, beginning with the tyrannous attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to force the Jews into idolatry, and ending with the death of the high priest Simon. The brief introduction (i. 1–9) deals with the history of 156 years (B.C. 331–175), being a sketch of the growth of the Macedonian power from the battle of Arbela onwards. The book is mainly occupied with the wise and heroic deeds of the three Maccabean brothers, Judas, Jonathan, and Simon. It is composed throughout with simplicity and seriousness in the style of the Old Testament, though it only indirectly recognises the intervention of God, and generally avoids the use of the sacred name.

The speeches no doubt are sometimes imaginary, and the numbers loose ; but in all other respects the narrative is trustworthy, and the writer made use of existing documents.¹ It was probably written in Hebrew or Aramaic by a devout and patriotic but unknown Palestinian Jew during the reign of John Hyrcanus, about B.C. 110.² It is only when the writer touches on foreign affairs that he falls into serious mistakes. Josephus and all subsequent writers have accepted his authority.

2. PARTIALLY HISTORIC.—*The Second Book of Maccabees* is greatly inferior to the first in historic credibility. It was probably written a hundred years later by a Jerusalem Hellenist and Pharisee ; and its chief object was the glorification of Judas Maccabeus. As “a poor and somewhat tawdry frontispiece” it begins with two spurious letters, supposed to be addressed by the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt. It covers the story of the twenty years between B.C. 180–161. It is full of historical errors, yet contains some valuable material. It was an attempt to embellish and popularize the history of an unknown Jason of Cyrene, whose five books it epitomised into one.³ It entirely differs in spirit from the first book, especially in that insistence upon holy places and rites, and on the doctrine of the resurrection, which shows that the writer leaned to the views of the *Chasidim*.⁴ He emphasises the religious and miraculous elements of his narrative, and shows a more developed faith in immortality, the resurrection, and the judgment to come than the previous writer.

3. PARÆNETIC FICTION.—The growth of religious fiction is a marked characteristic of the later phases of Jewish literature. In the Books of Tobit and Judith we have the

¹ See 1 Mace. ix. 22, xvi. 23, 24.

² The curious name by which Origen alludes to the book, Σαρβὴ Σαρβανελ, seems to be אָל בְּנֵי שָׁרֶקֶת, “History of the Princes of the Sons of God.”

³ 2 Macc. ii. 23.

⁴ See 2 Macc. vii., xii. 43–45, xiv. 46 ff.

precursors of the vast Haggadistic collections, of which so many strange specimens are found in the literary activity of the rabbinic schools in later ages.

(1) The *Book of Tobit* has always been a deserved favourite. It is a gentle, childlike, genial, domestic story, written mainly with the object of teaching the Jews to glorify God among the heathen.¹ It exhibits a pious and practical spirit, and reflects the ideal of the Scribes, attaching great importance to fasting and alms. Whether it is a pure romance, or whether it had any bases in tradition, we cannot tell. The date is entirely conjectural, nor can we be certain whether it was originally written in Hebrew or in Greek.² It is remarkable for its developed angelology and demonology, and was probably the work of a Jew of the Dispersion. It constitutes, as Ewald says, “the fairest monument of the spirit of the Jews in the distant East during these centuries.” All readers are pleased in spite of themselves by the introduction of the superfluous dog of the young man in v. 16, xi. 4; and all the more when we know that all mention of the dog is omitted in the Chaldee and Hebrew texts, and that this is the only instance in Hebrew literature of any regard for the despised dog of the East.³ But it is inexcusable that the angel Raphael should be introduced as calmly saying what is not true (v. 6, 12). The standard of spirituality and belief is far below that of the humblest book of the Old Testament; but we may say of it with Luther, “Is it history? then it is a holy history. Is it fiction? then is it a truly beautiful, wholesome, and profitable fiction.”⁴

¹ See Tob. i. 4, 8; iv. 15; v. 13; xii. 8; xiii. 3, 5.

² From the phrase *καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς* in Tob. vii. 7, it has been inferred that it was written in Greek.

³ Ambrose (*Hexaem.* vi. 4, § 17) says that Raphael uses the dog to help in the training of Tobias.

⁴ The book is alluded to by Talmudists in Palestine till the third century, but after that only in Babylon. Hamburger, *Talm. Wörterb.* ii. 70.

(2) *The Book of Judith* is written in a prophetic-poetic style, and is pronounced by Ewald to be "as a work of art quite perfect." It is an absolute fiction, written originally in Hebrew. Its object was partly religious, partly patriotic. It was intended to recommend Pharisaic principles in the strict observance of times and rules, and to show that the Jews would only be conquered if they transgressed the law.¹ Judith wins the aid of God by her ceremonial purity and legal scrupulousness. The names are probably allusive associations. Judith recalls Judas; by the Assyrians are meant the Syrians; Nineveh the Great stands for Antioch the Great; Arphaxad recalls "Artaxata and Arsacides"; and Holofernes is slightly transliterated from the Persian title Orophernes. The same patriotic Haggada occurs in various forms in the Midrashim.² The moral ideal presented by the character of Judith in almost every particular, except those of patriotism and formalism, is extremely low.

4. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC FICTION.—The practice of pseudepigraphy is one of the decisive marks of a decadent literature. Writers who were too depressed and diffident to claim attention for themselves, claimed it on the spurious authority of some venerable name. The stories of Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon, are found in the additions to the Book of Daniel.

There was nothing morally wrong in pseudepigraphy; but thus to fight behind a visor shows a certain artificiality of sentiment, and a lack of vigorous and independent life.

(1) *The History of Susanna* is chiefly interesting as having furnished one of the finest specimens of early criticism in the letter of Julius Africanus to Origen impugning its authenticity. The reply of Origen is one of the few extant letters of the great Alexandrian thinker. It is highly curious, but it must be admitted that it shows

¹ Comp. Tob. xiv. 10.

² Jellinek, *Beth hamidrasch* i. 130.

the lack of the critical and historic spirit which was one of Origen's chief limitations, and that Julius Africanus had very much the best of the argument in all respects. Without going so far as to call the story a *fabula ineptissima*, and even admitting that it compares favourably with many stories of the Haggada, it is still the poorest book in the whole Apocrypha, and the attempt to treat it as genuine and historical is entirely futile. The Fathers made Susanna the type of the Church tempted by Paganism and Judaism. In the interesting introduction to this book by Mr. Ball, he quotes evidence from Brüll to show that the story probably originated in a desire to support the views of the Pharisees against those of the Sadducees as to *the examination of witnesses*. The traditional sentence ascribed to Simeon ben Shetach in the *Pirqé Abóth* is, “*Examine the witnesses abundantly*”; and it was the fruit of bitter experience, since his own son had fallen a victim to the false accusation of witnesses suborned by his enemies. The little romance had therefore a good didactic purpose—that of remedying the crying evil of a badly administered justice. It is a story with a purpose, and is aimed at “painted Pharisees” like the dissolute elders, and at worldly Sadducees.

(2) The story of *Bel and the Dragon* has no pretence to be historical, but is an early Haggadic satire upon the frauds and follies of idolatrous worship. In the LXX. it is said to be “*from the Prophecy of Habakkuk son of Jesus, of the tribe of Levi.*”

5. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC AND UNHISTORIC COMPLETIONS OF SCRIPTURE BOOKS.—To this class belong the *Prayer of Manasses*, an addition to 2 Chronicles xxxiii., and the *Prayer of Azarias*, and the *Song of the Three Children*, an addition to Daniel iii.; the *Epistle of Jeremy*, a somewhat feeble cento of scriptural phrases, artificial and monotonous; the *Book of Baruch*, a very secondhand and imitative *rifaci-*

mento of passages in Daniel, Jeremiah, and other writers, though in some passages it gives "no unworthy echo of old prophetic voices"; and the *Rest of the Book of Esther*, the work perhaps of some Alexandrian Jew, with spurious documents and copious introduction of the name of God, which is absent from the canonical Book. More important than these is the *First Book of Esdras*, which is indeed "little more than a reproduction of parts of the Second Book of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah," and is an incomplete and loosely arranged series of un-authentic documents, touching on parts of Jewish history from B.C. 623-445.¹ Even Sixtus Senensis describes these books as *lacinias hinc quorumdam scriptorum temeritate insertas*. It has however one independent section (iii. 1-v. 6). Perhaps Luther spoke as favourably of these books as is permissible, when he compared them to corn-flowers in a wheatfield, but "placed in a separate bed, that they may not wither, because there is much good in them." The Book of Esdras however he (metaphorically) "tossed into the Elbe."

6. APOCALYPTIC.—The *Second Book of Esdras* is a very interesting specimen of a Jewish Apocalypse, and furnishes data of great importance for the true method of interpreting the Revelation of St. John. It was written in Greek, and consists of three revelations and four visions, in which the doubts of Ezra about the dark present and the uncertain future are removed, and a sort of theodiceæ is attempted. The first, second, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters stand apart from the main Apocalypse, and were probably the interpolation of a Christian Jew of Alexandria, added to the original book about A.D. 200. This melancholy book offends by its crude imagery, but is not without a sombre merit

¹ The Bishop of Bath and Wells points out that the author uses "Medes and Persians" and "Persians and Medes" indiscriminately, as he happens to be imitating Daniel or Esther.

n its endeavour to grapple with the awful problems and perplexities of human life. Gloom and despondency are its prevalent characteristics (vii. 70; viii. 52-55; ix. 13; xiv. 10 ff., etc.). The Vision of the Eagle (xi., xii.) shows that the book may have been written in the reign of Domitian (between A.D. 81-96).¹ The author seems to have been a Jew by religion (*see* vi. 49), and perhaps an Alexandrian, though he uses language (vii. 29) which is surprising in any Jew after the death of Christ.² Jerome speaks of this book contemptuously, and rebukes Vigilantius for quoting its authority.

7. It only remains to speak of the books which we describe as

SAPIENTIAL.—They belong to the class of literature known by the Jews as the Chokhmah (חָכְמָה), and they used to be quoted by the Fathers with the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes under the general head of *Πανάρετος Σοφία*. The Jews had no theoretic philosophy which can be properly so called. Their philosophy was mainly a practical application of the lessons of experience and revelation embodied in the antithetic, and more or less poetic, form of proverb and moral apologue (לִשְׁנָה). It recognises that man's chief wisdom consists in trusting God and obeying the law.

(1) The *Book of Ecclesiasticus* is perhaps the oldest entire book of the Apocrypha.³ It gives us a vivid picture of the customs and modes of thought which prevailed in the days when it was written. It is specially interesting because in it we trace the germinal elements of the chief form of later Jewish thought. It reflects the moderate orthodoxy of

¹ The vision has been most variously understood and explained, and consequently the suggested dates for the book vary widely.

² See Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judicorum*, p. lxi.

³ The name seems to mean "Church reading book" *quo vocabulo*, says Rufinus, . . . *scripturae qualitas cognominata est.*

Judaism before the days of that burning party spirit which drove both Pharisees and Sadducees into the falsehood of extremes. The original work was perhaps written about B.C. 235. It is Palestinian, not Alexandrian; but the Hebrew writer—the only writer of the Apocrypha who has not concealed his identity by anonymity or pseudopigraphy—had felt the influence of the Greek cities established in Palestine. “We might almost characterize it,” says Dr. Edersheim, “as alike Pharisæic before the Pharisees, Sadducean before the Sadducees, and Hellenistic before Hellenism.” And yet it is not eclectic—only preparatory. It contains much that is wise and beautiful, and was almost certainly known to St. James¹ and to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It has also influenced Christian hymnology, and is quoted as “Scripture” by some of the Fathers. Bunyan has recorded how profoundly he was comforted by the verse, “Look at the generations of old, and see: did ever any trust in the Lord, and was confounded?” (Ecclus. x. 2;) and how he was at first a little damped to find that it only occurred in an uncanonical book; but that he was comforted by regarding it as an epitome of many scriptural promises, so that “the word doth still oft-times shine before my face.” Yet its morality is very much poorer and thinner than that of the Book of Proverbs. The Son of Sirach is often merely prudential, not unfrequently commonplace, and sometimes positively coarse. His religion is legalistic, his theology vague, and his hopes of the future extremely dim.² His ideal is that of a respectable egotist with a tinge of fatalism and superstition. Yet as a sort of ethical manual, compiled in part from previous gnomologies, his book had its value, and the celebration of the saints and heroes of Judaism so finely introduced in chapter xliv. is a work of entire originality and great beauty.

¹ See especially Jas. v. 3; Ecclus. xii. 10, 11, xxix. 10.

² See xiv. 16; xvii. 27, 28; xliv. 14, 15.

(2) Lastly, the *Book of Wisdom* must be regarded as in some respects the greatest and most original book of the Apocrypha. It also exhibits the distinctest impress of Hellenic culture and philosophy, showing traces both of Stoic and Platonic doctrine.¹ It was written by a man of undoubted genius, of wide knowledge, of poetic imagination, of forcible eloquence, of great literary skill. The author was evidently an Alexandrian Jew, who combined Hellenic culture with Hebrew faithfulness. No book has produced a deeper effect on the language and imagery of some of the New Testament writers than this. In its theology and eschatology, its idealism, its recognition of God's universal love, its comparative tolerance, and its belief in some form of immortality, it marks the highest point of religious knowledge obtained by the Jews in the period between the close of the Old Testament and the dawn of the Gospel dispensation. The book had a threefold object—hortatory, apologetic, and polemical. Its polemic was aimed first at apostate Jews and then at idolaters. The dates assigned for the book by critics vary between B.C. 217 and A.D. 40, and the later date is far more probable than the former. Yet with all its merits the Book of Wisdom has such serious defects and limitations as to place it very far below the Books of Proverbs or Ecclesiastes. A German editor tells us that in editing the Book of Esdras he began with something like contempt, and ended with a qualified admiration. The present writer is free to confess that, beginning to study the Book of Wisdom with high admiration, he ended with a deepened sense of the chasm which separates the highest forms of Apocryphal literature from the canonical books of the old dispensation. An attentive study will show that among the many jewels of thought and expression with which the book is studded, it is often artificial in its colouring, narrow in its particularism, and sweeping in its gene-

¹ Wisd. vii. 24; viii. 1, 7, 20; ix. 15.

ralizations. Yet with all its defects it is a book which will better repay study than any other in the Apocrypha, and which the world will not willingly let die.

Such in swift summary is the body of Jewish uncanonical literature which, under the supervision of a most competent editor, is now published, with an exegetical apparatus which leaves the general reader little to desire. Large and various ability has been shown by some of the commentators upon this adjunct to the *Speaker's Bible*, and certainly the greater part of the work stands fully on the level of the best specimens of exposition contained in the previous volumes of this useful and important work. The reader will be taught neither to underrate the Apocrypha nor to exaggerate its intrinsic merit. Much of its importance is, so to speak, accidental; in other words, it depends not on the actual thoughts of the writers, but on the light which their works throw upon the events of Jewish history and the growth of Jewish opinion in an epoch which would otherwise be left dark. Surely no decree more fatal and reckless was ever passed by any Church Council than that in which the Council of Trent, misled chiefly by the authority of St. Augustine on a question as to which St. Jerome was a far more competent judge, declared that the Church "*pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur*" the Apocryphal books as those of the Old and New Testament. Still more inexcusably the Council anathematized all who do not receive "these entire books with all their parts as sacred and canonical." The authenticity of the Apocryphal books, their credibility, their literary value, their moral teaching, their theological doctrine stand immeasurably below those of the canonical books. In these books the harp of Judah has ceased to vibrate, and the humblest psalm of David is worth all such poetry as they contain. The voice of prophecy has entirely ceased to be heard in them, and its cessation is accepted

with all the resignation of conscious inferiority.¹ Above all, the Divine Messianic hope which lay at the heart of all that was noblest and most inspiring in Jewish religion has either evaporated altogether, or has lost its priceless personal element in exchange for a vague national aspiration. Pseudogigraphy, literary weakness, extravagances and exaggeration, fiction assuming the form of history, spurious documents, a general secondhandness and lack of original force, gross errors in geography and chronology, the substitution of bare morality and outward formalism for spiritual communion with God, are all marks of a decadent literature and a petrifying religion. The Church reads these books, as St. Jerome says, and as our Article repeats, "for example of life and instruction of manners"; but as she reads them she feels the ever-deepening conviction, that whereas the sibyl of inspiration, "speaking things simple, and unperfumed, and unadorned, reaches through myriads of years because of God," the voice which speaks to us in these books is the voice of a purely human wisdom, often fallible, often feeble, sometimes profoundly erroneous, never elevated beyond the range of our criticism, and which not unfrequently must submit to our emphatic rejection. I will not go nearly so far as the learned Dr. Lightfoot, who, in a sermon preached in St. Margaret's, Westminster, before the House of Commons in 1643, spoke of the "wretched Apocrypha" as "a patchery of human invention," divorcing the end of the law from the beginning of the Gospel. To speak of these books in a tone of entire contempt is unjustifiable. The study of the Apocrypha is full of interest and instructiveness, and it will serve a most valuable subsidiary purpose if it leaves on our minds the impression

¹ 1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41 (Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65). It is true that the Book of Wisdom claims (vii. 27) that "in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets"; but this is a "prophecy" of a lower and more general order.

that, whatever may be our attempts to define inspiration, the teaching of the Old and New Testament stands incomparable and alone ; and that no other book can be said, like the Bible, to be “ vast and wide as the world, rooted in the abysses of creation, and towering up beyond the blue secrets of heaven ! Sunrise and sunset, promise and fulfilment, birth and death, the whole drama of humanity are in the Bible, and there alone.” “ Its eclipse would be the return of chaos, its extinction the epitaph of history.”

F. W. FARRAR.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

II. CHRIST AND THE PROPHETS (CHAP. I. 1-4.)

THIS long, sonorous sentence forms the introduction to the whole Epistle, is, as it were, the portico of an august temple, its many weighty clauses being as rows of stately ornamental pillars supporting the roof. This temple front has a most imposing aspect ! It fills the mind with awe, and disposes one to enter the sacred edifice in religious silence, rather than to indulge in critical remarks. Sensible of this, let us remember the wise counsel, “ let thy words be few,” and refrain from attempting to express the inexpressible.

In these opening verses the writer announces at once the theme of his discourse, and introduces the leading thoughts on which he intends to expatiate. It has been suggested that the rhetorical style of the writing may be the reason why it does not begin with salutations, but rushes at once *in medias res*. Be this as it may, the writer certainly does at once plunge into the heart of his subject, setting forth Christ as the supreme object of religious regard—superior

to prophets, priests, and angels ; the Apostle through whom God made His final revelation to men ; the Priest who effectually and for ever made that purification of sins which levitical sacrifices failed to accomplish ; the Maker, Heir, and Sustainer of all things ; not only above angels, but equal to God, being His eternal Son and perfect image.

The first point to be noticed in the proem is the contrast drawn, in antithetic terms, between the Old and the New Testament revelations. “God, having spoken of old in many parts and in many modes, to the fathers in the prophets, spake at the end of these days to us in (His) Son.”

By “the prophets” may be meant those strictly so called, but more probably the phrase is meant to cover the whole Old Testament revelation, including the law-giving ; the recognition of the angels as the agents by whom the law was given being rather a concession to Jewish opinion than the expression of the writer’s own view. To be noted is the use of the phrase “the fathers” absolutely, as the recipients of the ancient revelation. It implies that the Epistle is meant solely for Jewish readers. Does it further imply that the writer recognises only Jewish Christians, or recognises Gentile Christians only on condition of their consenting first to become Jews by submitting to the rite of circumcision ? In that case we should have to say that the writer was not merely not Paul, but not even a Paulinist, a man, that is, sympathising with the position taken up by Paul in the great controversy between him and the Judaists. This however I cannot believe. The Epistle, though apparently identifying Christendom with the Hebrew Church, is manifestly universalistic in spirit. No one who considers the freedom with which the writer speaks of levitical institutions as weak, useless, doomed to pass away, can imagine him having any difficulty about recognising Gentile Christians without their being required

to submit to circumcision, any more than one who understands the spirit of Christ's teaching can think of Him as attaching religious importance to the Jewish national rite, although in the Gospels, as in this Epistle, there is no express indication of opinion on the subject. Then on the principle that a man is known from the company he keeps, Pauline sympathies may be inferred from the writer's acquaintance with Timothy. That acquaintanceship makes it all but certain that he could not be ignorant of the controversy, and therefore cannot be conceived of as one to whom the question between Paul and the Judaists had not occurred, and who was in the same state of mind as if he had written his book before the controversy arose. He must have had an opinion on the subject; and under whatever influences he had been reared, Palestinian or Alexandrian, we may be sure that his sympathies were on the side of universalism. While therefore he is not to be identified with Paul, he may be regarded as a Paulinist; not in the sense that he resembles or follows Paul in the details of his theology, which he certainly does not, but in the sense that for him, as for Paul, the Israel of God means all in every land that believe in Christ, and that in Christ for him, as for Paul, there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile.

Very remarkable are the terms employed to describe the character of the Old Testament revelation. It is characterized as a piecemeal multiform revelation. For what purpose are these epithets employed? Hardly for the purpose of mere literary description, to suggest, for example, the picturesque nature of the Hebrew literature; still less for the purpose of pointing out its spiritual excellences. Rather, to indicate the inferiority of the earlier revelation, that the Hebrew Christians might not cling to it as something final. This end these epithets are well fitted to serve. The first of the two points to a fact with which the first readers of the Epistle were perfectly familiar.

They knew that the Divine communications to Israel came bit by bit: the promise by Abraham; the law by Moses; the songs of the sanctuary by David and other poets; the wisdom of life by Solomon and the other sages of Israel; and by the prophets commonly so called, to relieve the gloom of the present, successive rays of light concerning Messiah and the Messianic kingdom. And of course they understood that no one of these partial, fragmentary revelations could be regarded as complete or final. Each successive piece of revelation proved the incompleteness of all that went before. But might not all the pieces taken together, when the last had been given, and the Hebrew canon was complete, amount to a full, adequate revelation, possessing the character of finality? The presumption was the other way. The likelihood was that the prophets collectively, including under that category all the men by whom the Hebrew books were written, were but luminaries of the night—street lamps set in a row to show travellers their way through the gloom; stars set in the spiritual firmament to mitigate the darkness till the sun should arise, bringing in the day.

This presumption is converted into certainty by the second epithet, which greatly strengthens the argument against finality suggested by the first. It gives us to understand that the ancient revelation was communicated, not only in many parts, but in many modes. The meaning is not so clear in this case, but the reference is probably to the various ways in which God held communication with those whom He employed as His agents, as in a vision, a dream, or the like. The general idea intended is plain. It is that the revelation made to each prophet was *relative*—relative to his temperament, circumstances, and historical position. This relativity or subjectivity of the ancient revelation makes it impossible to add together the separate pieces of revelation, and so bring out the whole final revelation. For

the pieces are not homogeneous fragments of one whole. They are heterogeneous wholes, often incapable of combination. This is most clearly seen in the Messianic prophecies uttered by successive prophets, which are not separate fragments of one picture of the future capable of being combined into a harmonious whole, but independent pictures, each exhibiting the future from its own point of view. This is clear enough to us; is it too much to suppose that it was clear to the writer of our Epistle, that he saw that the prophecies were such that no man could tell what the future was to be till Jesus, the last of the prophets and the fulfiller of the prophecies, came and showed the true nature of Messiah and His kingdom? Some such idea as this, I think, he meant to suggest by the word *πολυτρόπως*. If that was his meaning, he certainly stated thereby an unanswerable argument against the finality of the ancient revelation, and in favour of a new, adequate, and therefore final revelation, which should give the key to the riddle of the Old Testament.

Of Him by whom the much needed new revelation was made the writer next proceeds to speak. "God hath, in the end of these days, spoken unto us in (His) Son." The revelation made in the Son is not qualified by descriptive epithets, as in the case of the earlier revelation, the reason being that such epithets in this case are not needed. The one expression, "in a Son," involves in itself a full antithesis to the fragmentary multiform revelation given to the fathers in the prophets. The absence of the article (*εν οὐδὲ*) gives it this significance, the idea being that a revelation through one standing to God in the relation of Son must be perfect in its mode, and complete and final in its contents. The thought suggested is substantially identical with that expressed in the beginning of the fourth Gospel, in the well known words: "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He

hath declared Him.” A Son dwelling in the bosom of the Divine Being, His Father, and knowing His inmost thoughts, is fit to be the perfect exegete of His mind : such is the implicit argument of Gospel and Epistle. This view implies that the Son must be the last speaker : no more remains to be said ; it implies also that He is the only speaker in the New Testament—apostles and apostolic men sinking into the subordinate position of witnesses, confirmers of what they have seen and heard of the incarnate Word, echoes of His voice, commanders of His teaching to the world.

The finality of the revelation made through the Son is expressly taught by the phrase “in the end of these days.” The writer expresses himself in accordance with the Jewish mode of viewing the history of the world as divided into two great periods, the present age, and the age to come. He conceives of Christ as the divider and maker of the ages (as of the worlds), coming at the end of the old time and inaugurating the new. What his conception of the coming age, which we now call the Christian era, was, we shall have other opportunities of considering. Meantime what we have to note is, that in his view the revelation made by the Son winds up the old age. It is the last word, if not absolutely, at least for the old world and all that belongs to it. It is a solemn announcement for unbeliefing Jews, and all who are inclined to cling to the past. For the end of the days means the end of the Jewish state. It is the judgment day of Israel. How important then to give heed to the Son !

Having made mention of the Son, the writer proceeds to invest Him with all due honours, Divine and mediatorial, to win for His word fitting attention. The elaborate encomium which follows presents a very high view of the Person of Christ. It ascribes to Him (by implication) pre-existence, an essential and therefore eternal relation to God,

universal heirship, participation in the Divine functions or making and upholding the world. One may speculate on the genesis of this christological creed, and conjecture that it was collected from such texts as those quoted in the sequel, or that the articles contained in it were inferences from the state of exaltation; the pre-existent state and all that goes along with it being, as it were, the projection into the eternal past of the image formed by the mind of the writer of the exalted and glorified Christ as He lives in heaven. But to indulge in such conjectures is to go outside the functions of exegesis. The text gives us no information on the point; it contains simply the creed of the writer, without a hint as to the history of its formation in his mind.

The one point calling for special notice in this statement of belief concerning the Son is, that in which He is declared to be the effulgence of God's glory and the exact image of His essence. In this way does the writer endeavour as exactly as possible to set forth the Son's relation to God. The terms he employs for this purpose are remarkable. They sound like an echo of words current in the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy, as represented by Philo, from whose pages scholars have collected examples of their use. How far the writer of our Epistle was acquainted with that philosophy we do not know; but there is that about his style of thought, expression, and argument which suggests the influence of the Alexandrian atmosphere, and gives plausibility if not probability to the conjecture of Luther, which has since found such wide acceptance, that he is to be identified with the Apollos mentioned in Acts xviii. 24-28, there described as "born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures." While keeping in view however the Alexandrian culture of the writer as a possible factor, we must be careful not to exaggerate the extent of its influence on his thought. We shall do wisely not to

make him a slavish follower of any school, whether Alexandrian, Pauline, or rabbinical, but to recognise frankly the free, independent activity of his mind, and to be on the outlook for originalities.

The two striking phrases in this clause express in different ways the likeness of the Son to God. On the one hand, He is declared to be the *apaugasma* of the Divine glory. The Greek word may signify either the direct radiance of a luminous object, or its reflected image, as of the sun in water. The ancient fathers for the most part preferred the former rendering: hence their phrase, "Light from Light," expressive of the essential relation subsisting between the Son and the Father. Some eminent modern interpreters, such as Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, and Grotius, have favoured the other view. It is impossible to decide authoritatively between the two interpretations, neither is it necessary, as either conveys the general idea intended sufficiently. Some reject both, and maintain that the idea suggested is that of rays of light coming out from the Divine glory, and forming themselves into a similar light-body.¹ This sense provides for the independent subsistence of the Son, but it lacks support in natural analogy.

The Son is next declared to be the *character* of the Divine *hypostasis*. The former of these two Greek words signifies an image produced by a graving tool, or stamped upon a receptive substance by a die, as the head of the reigning sovereign is stamped upon the current coin of the realm. The latter of these interpretations is reflected in the rendering of the Authorized Version, "the express image." The point of importance is the exactness of the likeness so produced. But the likeness of what? Of God's "person" according to our translators, who thus ascribed to the term hypostasis the developed technical sense it came to bear in

¹ So B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Bib. Theol. des N. T.*, and after him Davidson.

the trinitarian controversy. Essence or essential being probably comes nearest to the writer's thought.

On the dogmatic import of the two figurative expressions, it has been remarked that they do not strictly exclude Sabellianism or Arianism. The Sabellians laid stress on the term *apaugasma* as suggesting the idea of a modal manifestation rather than of a distinct personality. The Arians, on the other hand, emphasised the term *character*, as implying a position of subordination or dependence belonging to the Son in relation to the Father. The orthodox, on their side, maintained that by the combination of the two both errors were excluded; the former phrase implying identity of nature, so excluding Arianism, the latter implying independent personality, so excluding Sabellianism.

We are on surer ground in asserting that the august attributes of the Son serve well the purpose of commanding Him to attention as the full and final Revealer of God to men. Who so fit to make God known as one who is related to Him as the sun's rays to the sun, and who resembles Him as the image impressed on wax resembles the seal? His Word must be as the bright light of day, than which nothing can be brighter, and He can say of Himself, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

The closing part of the encomium on the Son remains to be noticed: "Who having made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

What the writer is chiefly concerned to declare is the exaltation of Christ to heavenly glory, his purpose throughout the proem being to state those things which tend to the honour of Him by whom God hath last spoken to men; therefore he refers to Christ's work on earth in a participial clause, as it were by the way. But while he adverts thus parenthetically to His priestly achievement, he has no desire to slur it over as if it were something to be ashamed of,—or something detracting from His glory. On the contrary,

he is careful to allude to it before making mention of the ascension, as if to suggest the thought that the honours conferred on the Son were well earned, while fitting one who bore that name. Another thought is latent in the connexion; *viz.* the effectual nature of Christ's priestly work. He purged sins once for all, and then sat down on His throne. Thus the very slightness of the reference to the priestly function serves to hint its surpassing excellence.

In the Textus Receptus the means of purification are specified: "When He had *by Himself* purged our sins." The words *by Himself*, omitted in the best codices, were a natural, almost inevitable addition, slipping from the margin into the text; for that Christ's offering was HIMSELF is one of the great leading ideas of the Epistle, written, so to speak, in large capitals. Yet it was not at all likely to be introduced here. The writer was too skilful a master of the art of persuasion to bring in so distinctive, and for his readers so difficult, a truth before he could make more of it than was possible at the outset. Therefore he contents himself with stating Christ's priestly achievement in the barest terms, reserving developments for a later stage.

At this point the lofty encomium on the Apostle and High Priest of the Christian confession touches the earth. But for this brief reference to the purification of sins, we might almost doubt whether the august personage spoken of in the proem had ever been in this world of time and sense. It is indeed natural to assume that the Son, being placed on a line with the prophets as an agent of revelation, like them appeared as a man among men, and heroically witnessed for truth amidst the contradictions of the world. But when we read on, and observe the lofty, superhuman epithets attached to the name, we half suspect that we have been mistaken, till we come to the words, "when He had purged sins," whereby we are reassured. Some hold that the purification itself took place in heaven; but even in that

case we touch the earth, at least inferentially. For purification implies blood shed, and bloodshedding implies death, and death bears witness to a previous incarnate life. Thus the priestly service, wherever performed, has a human history for its background—a history which when inquired into will doubtless turn out to be full of instruction, pathos, inspiration, and consolation. It might be said, that it was the interest of one writing to tempted Hebrews to make as much use as possible of this history, to bid them look to the Man Jesus, and to show them this Man in His brotherly sympathy, heroic fidelity, and manifold experience of trial, so that they might see Him in a way fitted to nerve them to endurance. We expect therefore and desire to find in this writing not a little relating to the earthly life of the Son. Our bias is not to relegate everything to heaven ; it is decidedly the opposite—we avow it at the outset,—to hold on firmly to the earth wherever we can, consistently with honest exegesis. That the priesthood of Christ is placed in the heavenly sanctuary is admitted, but it is a question how far this is due to the apologetic method of the Epistle. We must distinguish between the form and the substance of the writer's thought, between his essential idea and the mode in which he states it in an argument constructed for the benefit of others. But of this more hereafter.

The exaltation is described in terms taken from Psalm ex., amplified by a rhetorical circumlocution for the Divine name. In other places the language employed for the same purpose is simpler, except in chap. viii. 1, where the formula becomes even more solemn : “sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.” There the session on the right hand seems to be referred to as the symbol and proof of the completeness, and therefore finality, of Christ's self-sacrifice. Here the aim rather is to make the exalted Christ completely eclipse the angels. For the long introductory sentence winds up with the de-

claration, that in taking His seat on the right hand of the Majesty on high Christ became “by so much better than the angels as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they.” Thus, after the manner of the writer, is the new theme woven into the old; for angels are to be the next subject of comparison with Christ. This statement has to our ears the effect of an anticlimax. It seems a small thing to say of One who sitteth at the right hand of God, that He is higher in dignity than angels. So it is in our view, the angels holding a very small place in our thoughts. But there were other thoughts in Jewish minds which rendered it needful to make such a statement.

This statement is not to be taken as implying that Christ attained to a better dignity than that of angels only in the state of exaltation. It does not necessarily mean more than that His superior dignity then became proportional to the intrinsic excellence of His name. It is not implied that He was in all respects beneath angels on earth; it is not even necessarily implied that He was beneath them in any respect, though from the sequel it appears that the writer did regard Jesus on earth as in some respect, not plainly indicated, inferior to angels. The statement before us is somewhat similar in character to one occurring in the opening paragraph of Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, where the apostle represents Christ as being constituted the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead. This implies that at His resurrection Christ became Son of God to some new effect, but it does not imply that He had not been Son of God before. In like manner the words now under consideration teach that at His ascension, which in this Epistle practically takes the place of the resurrection, Christ became to some new effect, or in an enhanced degree, superior to angels; but they do not imply that previously He had been absolutely inferior to angels, or, as some maintain, subject to their dominion, in common

with the whole old world—under them as He was under the law. Whether such a view is taught anywhere in the Epistle remains to be seen. It certainly cannot be said to be taught here.

A. B. BRUCE.

NOTES ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

(I.—VII.)

THE history of the early Christian Church has been studied of late years with special care, and the unique importance of the record transmitted to us in the Acts of the Apostles has in consequence been more distinctly recognised than before. But its language has not received from scholars and critics the same minute attention that has been bestowed upon the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul and St. John. Men persuade themselves perhaps that the study of historians' language has little bearing on the facts which they detail. But this view does not apply at all events to a history which recorded language, sentiments, and actions while they were still fresh in the memory of living men. Even in purely narrative sections graphic touches of truth and rich colouring of facts are often lost to the English reader. I propose then to point out some details, which can only be gathered from study of the Greek text. It is doubtless disappointing, after all the ability and industry recently devoted to the Revised Version, to turn still to the Greek text as a treasure house of knowledge, not to be found in either English Version, valuable as both are. But the position of an independent student is more favourable to minute criticism of language than that of a revision committee; and if I am not mistaken, individual criticism

has still work left to do in the Acts of the Apostles. I proceed then to give my readers some of my own gleanings in this field for whatever they may be worth.

i. 3. The extent and nature of the intercourse which our risen Lord maintained with His disciples during the forty days is of the deepest interest, both by reason of its own spiritual significance, and on account of the variation of different narratives. Now a singularly clear and expressive summary of His visits is given in the words *διπτανόμενος δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσ.*, reminding us a little of 1 Corinthians xv. 5-7. The unusual part. pres. *διπτανόμενος* (corresponding to a substantive *διπτασία* elsewhere used for a heavenly vision) sets exactly before us the visible manifestations by which He, from time to time, revealed to His disciples His unseen presence: during forty days He showed Himself to their bodily sight. Now the older version "*being seen of them*" fails to express the occasional nature of these visits; the Revised loses the distinctness of actual sight in the less definite term *appearing*, and introduces an incorrect scriptural phrase *by the space*, which always expresses continuous action or duration throughout certain limits of time or space, and not occasional occurrences.

i. 6. Both versions suggest the idea of a fresh assembly and reappearance of our Lord by the words, *when they were come together*, as if the Greek had been *συνεληνθότες*. But it is really *συνελθόντες ἤρωτων*, *they coming together began to ask*, and intimates apparently that immediately on hearing their Lord's charge they came together, perhaps gathered round Him, to inquire His will concerning the future.

i. 10. We gather naturally from the statement, that *two men stood by them in white apparel*, in the description of the Ascension, that these heavenly visitants stood beside the disciples on earth; but *παρειστήκεισαν* states merely that they presented themselves, or *stood before them*, apparently

in the heavens into which they were intently gazing, much as Moses and Elijah are represented on the mount of transfiguration.

i. 14. The words *with the women* suggest that a definite congregation of believing women had already been formed ; but the Gospels never speak of *the women*, except where certain women have been mentioned immediately before, and the Greek $\sigma\bar{\nu}\nu \gamma\nu\nu\alpha\xi\bar{\nu}$ indicates merely the presence of women headed by the mother of Jesus.

i. 17-20. It is obvious to every reader that the rhetorical account of Judas' fate, and the local references to the people of Jerusalem and their language, cannot form part of the speech of Peter, but that *vv. 18, 19* must be placed in a parenthesis, as due to the historian. But this lands us in a further difficulty ; for *v. 20* is obviously not a continuation of the speech from *v. 17*, but a scriptural quotation, referring to the death of Judas related in the two previous verses. And an examination of the passages themselves confirms this view that they were quoted by the subsequent historian ; for the words $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\lambda\bar{\iota}s$ and $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\omega\pi\bar{\iota}v$ refer to pastoral and episcopal functions of an Apostle, which could not be fully realised till after the foundation of the Christian Church. The parenthesis must therefore be extended to embrace *v. 20*, and the speech of Peter is resumed at *v. 21*, with the appropriate words $\delta\epsilon\bar{\iota} \bar{o}\bar{\nu}$, answering to $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\bar{\iota}$ in *v. 16*. What then is to become of the reference to the Book of Psalms in *v. 16*? A careful examination of *v. 17* in the Greek solves the difficulty. The opening word $\bar{o}\tau\bar{i}$ has been mistranslated. For $\bar{o}\tau\bar{i}$ in the language of St. Luke means *that* or *because*, and connects together two clauses of a double sentence. It is often rightly rendered *for* in a strictly causal sense (= because), but cannot introduce a separate explanatory sentence, like that before us in our versions. In this place $\bar{o}\tau\bar{i}$ means *that*, and the two verses form one sentence, as follows : *It was needful that the Scripture*

should be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost forewarned us by the mouth of David concerning Judas, which beeame guide to them that took Jesus, that he had been numbered among us and received a portion in this ministry. It appears from this that the language of the Book of Psalms, to which the Apostle is referring, is the warning of Psalm xli. 9, that one who had been numbered among them was to be a traitor. He does not quote the words; but all his hearers knew them well, for Christ's warning, followed by Judas' treachery, had imprinted them on all their hearts: "I know whom I have chosen, but that the Scripture might be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against Me." It was only natural for Peter to shrink at that time from more precise repetition of the words; but his thought is quite distinct.

i. 18. Our versions read "*with the reward*," but the Greek is *ἐκ μισθοῦ*, *out of the price*, and suggests at once Zechariah xi. 12, "So they weighed for my price (*μισθόν*, LXX.) thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, the goodly *price* that I was prised at of them." The same term *μισθὸν ἀδικίας* recurs in 2 Peter ii. 15.

i. 25. The spirit of the assembly in regard to their lost brother is misrepresented in our versions, for they imply a special purpose in his fall, "*that he might go*," whereas the Greek *πορευθῆνται*, *to go*, merely states its result.

i. 23-26. We come next to the election of Matthias. The Revised Version is almost painfully literal in rendering the words of prayer, *show of these two the one whom Thou hast chosen*, but seems to me to miss the spirit by retaining the word *show*. For the Greek is *ἀνάδειξον*, as in the case of the *appointment* of the seventy: and the prayer is not that God would *show* to them the one whom He had chosen, but that He would *declare* him through the medium of the lot. The assembly had already *appointed* (*εστησαν*) Joseph

Barsabbas and Matthias (not *put forward*) ; and did not now *give lots for them*, but *gave them lots*, i.e. they handed lots to the two selected candidates to place in some sort of balloting urn ; and the lot which first leapt out on its being shaken determined the successful candidate. This decision of the lot, following on their prayer, was accepted as the declaration of God's will ; and Matthias was accordingly selected the twelfth Apostle ($\sigmaυγκατεψηφισθη$), not simply *numbered with the eleven*, which suggests some inferiority to the original eleven.

ii. 3-6. The second chapter brings us to the day of Pentecost. The Greek presents to me a more graphic picture of the scene than I find in our versions, $\ddot{\alpha}\phi\thetaησαν$. . . $\pi\nu\rho\acute{s}$, tongues like as of fire were seen of them to divide, and it sat upon each one of them. After the account in v. 4 of the *different* ($\acute{e}t\acute{e}r\acute{a}is$) tongues in which the Spirit gave them utterance, the Greek says in v. 6 $\gamma\acute{e}νομένης \tau\acute{h}s \phi\omega\acute{r}h\acute{s} \tau\acute{a}v\acute{t}h\acute{s}$, *when this voice came*. I cannot think $\phi\omega\acute{r}h\acute{s}$ (*voice*) can mean merely the hearing of a sound, as the Revised Version translates it.

ii. 23. The Revised Version writes here *by the hand of lawless men*. The word $\acute{a}n\acute{o}mou\nu$, applied here to Pilate and his soldiers, is no doubt invidious ; it regards them from an Israelite point of view as *men without law* because they did not obey their law, and so had committed the great sin of crucifying the Messiah, but they could scarcely be called lawless.

ii. 37. The people had been excited by the miraculous gift of tongues, and Peter had pressed home upon them their guilt and danger for their share in the crucifixion of the Messiah. The effect is heard in the despairing appeal of his conscience-stricken hearers, *What are we to do, brethren !* $\tau\acute{i} \pi\acute{o}i\acute{h}s\omega\mu\nu$, $\acute{a}n\acute{d}rēs \acute{a}dēlphoi$; whereas their words as given in our versions read more like a request for advice. In like manner the council in anxious perplexity how to

deal with prisoners so dangerous as the Apostles, exclaim, “What are we to do with these men !” (iv. 16.)

ii. 47. The same subject is pursued in the following verses, and the burden of Peter’s exhortation is given in the words, “save yourselves” (ii. 40). Here then we have the key to the meaning of $\tau. \sigmaωζομένους$: it means those that would be saved, rather than those that *should be saved*, —those who were *saving themselves* by fleeing to the shelter of the Church from the wrath to come.

ii. 42. The older version records that Christians *continued stedfast* believers in the apostles’ *doctrine*: it is not quite clear what the Revised Version means by their *continning stedfastly in the apostles’ teaching*; but $\deltaιδαχή$ seems to mean *teaching*, not *doctrine*, and $\piρoσκaρтeρoῦnτeς \tau. \deltaιδaχή$ to denote their continual attendance on the Apostles’ teaching in the temple; the following words add to this their stedfast adherence to the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers of the Church.

ii. 44, 45. The community of goods in the Church of Jerusalem is continually quoted as an authority for socialist theories; but I see no trace in the Greek text of any but genuine Christian socialism. We are told that they *kept selling* ($\epsilon\pi\pi\rho\alpha\sigma\kappa oν$) their property and distributing to the necessities of the poor, as every man had need. So in iv. 34 it is said that possessors of lands or houses kept selling them and bringing the prices ($\piωλoῦnτeς \epsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\oν$) to lay at the Apostles’ feet for distribution, according as any one had need. Barnabas’ sale of land is mentioned as exceptional, and Ananias’ retention of his property as perfectly consistent with his Christian profession. Clearly therefore the Christians retained private property; and $\epsilon\iota\chi\oν \ddot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\kappaouά$ means simply that *they held all things common*; that is to say, in the enthusiasm of Christian charity they treated their property as the property of their brethren, rather than their own, and devoted it freely to any necessary demand.

of Christian love, choosing to impoverish themselves rather than let a brother want bread.

ii. 47. Our versions speak of the Christians *having favour with all the people*, as if the Greek were $\chiάριν \epsilonχοντες παρ' ὅλῳ τ. λαῷ$ (compare Luke i. 30; ii. 52). But it is $\epsilonχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τ. λαόν$ “*giving Him thanks before all the people.*” $\epsilonχειν χάριν$ always means *to give thanks*, though once wrongly translated (Heb. xii. 28).

iii. 13. Our versions speak of God *having glorified Jesus*, as though the reference were to His *present glory* in heaven; but in the Greek text ($\epsilonδόξασεν$) the glory which God gave His servant Jesus *on earth* is mentioned as an aggravation of His people’s guilt in rejecting Him. “God glorified Him, but ye denied Him.”

iii. 15, v. 31. Our versions speak of Jesus as a *prince* and carry the thoughts of the reader to the kingly office of the Messiah. But the Greek word $\alphaρχηγός$ does not mean *prince*, but either captain or first founder. Joshua and the spies were chosen from amidst the *captains* of their tribes; the Persian captains who escorted Nehemiah to Jerusalem bore the same title. It is here used with significant allusion to the name Jesus. The earlier Jesus (Joshua) was God’s first captain, to lead His people into their promised inheritance; in this he was type of the second Jesus, who first led His people into the inheritance of eternal life. The meaning of the name Jesus is still further developed in v. 31 by the addition “*a Captain and a Saviour*”: for it was said to Joseph, “Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins.”

iv. 5. The words “*in Jerusalem*” are clearly out of place in a narrative of events that took place entirely at Jerusalem, and in the mention of a council that met regularly at Jerusalem. A glance at the Greek text shows that the words belong really to $\tauοὺς γραμματεῖς$, and describe “*the scribes that were in Jerusalem,*” by way of distinction from

those scattered about the cities of Israel. The same construction occurs in vii. 44, 45 ; and is common in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

v. 14. *μᾶλλον* seems to mean, not *the more*, but *more and more* ; i.e. in ever-increasing number.

v. 38, 39. Gamaliel's peroration loses to my mind much of its pithy force by a mistranslation of *ὅτι* as *for*, whereas it depends, I think, on a second *λέγω* understood ; and by the unfortunate translation of *μήποτε* as *lest haply*, which the Revisers have adopted throughout the New Testament. I should give the following as a literal translation : “I say that if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown : but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them. Never be found actually fighting against God.” The addition of *ποτε* to *μή*, either in interrogation or in negation, gives additional emphasis.

v. 9. Ananias and his wife are charged with agreeing together to *tempt the Spirit of the Lord*. The Greek word *πειράσαι* is clear enough as including, besides temptation to evil, any kind of trial of the spirit within a man (compare 2 Cor. xiii. 5, Rev. ii. 2). So here Ananias and his wife are charged with having conspired together to *try* whether the Spirit, that was in the Apostles, could be deceived by their false statements. But this is not expressed with equal clearness in the English versions.

v. 16. The English versions give the impression of a general restoration of all that had unclean spirits in the cities round Jerusalem, for they say that they brought *them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one* : but the literal rendering of the Greek *οὐχλουμένους . . . (not τοὺς οὐχλουμένους)* is “*men vexed with unclean spirits, who were all healed.*”

vii. 13. *Ἐγνωρισθη* has the same force of the middle voice as *ἀνεγνωρίζετο* in Genesis xlv. 1. (LXX.), from which this passage is quoted ; and should be similarly translated, “made

himself known." In the same verse the Revised Version changes *kindred* into *race*—wrongly, as I think, for it was not Joseph's race in the distant East, but his family in Palestine that became manifest to Pharaoh. The translation "kindred" in Acts iv. 6 for $\gamma\acute{e}v\sigma$, strongly supports the same here.

vii. 17. The Revised Version speaks of the promise which God *vouchsafed*; but $\delta\acute{m}\omega\lambda\omega\gamma\epsilon\bar{\nu}$, when it does not mean confession or thanksgiving, denotes a distinct agreement (Matt. xiv. 7); and God's promise to Abraham was of the nature of a covenant, that if he forsook his country at God's word, God would make of him a great nation.

vii. 19. Pharaoh is said in our versions to have *dealt subtilly with* the Israelites. The same expression recurs in 1 Samuel xxiii. 22, where the LXX. use $\pi\alpha\nu\omega\rho\gamma\epsilon\bar{\nu}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; and in Psalm cv. 25, where the LXX. use $\delta\omega\lambda\iota\omega\bar{\nu}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. But $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\phi\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which is quoted from Exodus i. 10, appears from etymology and usage to signify, rather, to bring low by subtlety. In the same verse the exposure of the Hebrew children by their own fathers is represented in the older version as the result, in the Revised as the object, of Pharaoh's oppression. But the Greek $\tau\omega\bar{\nu}\ \pi\omega\epsilon\bar{\nu}$ conveys to me the meaning that his evil device and evil treatment of Israel specially consisted in his *having their babes cast out*: and this agrees with the history in Exodus.

vii. 21. Our versions say that Pharaoh's daughter *nourished Moses for her own son*. The Greek is $\grave{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\theta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\tau\alpha\ \grave{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\eta}\ e\bar{s}\ \bar{\nu}\iota\bar{o}\bar{r}$. The same verb is used by St. Paul when describing himself as *brought up* at the feet of Gamaliel, and implies here apparently that Pharaoh's daughter brought up Moses to manhood; she *brought him up to be a son to her*.

vii. 24. $\eta\mu\acute{\nu}\nalpha\tau\alpha$ (aor. mid.) cannot mean that he *defended* the Israelite. Its true meaning is, he retaliated on the Egyptian oppressor, which is in accordance with the history.

vii. 44, 45. We owe to the Revised Version a correct rendering of *διαδεξάμενοι*, “*in their turn*,” but it is unintelligible for want of a further correction. The Greek distinguishes two successive generations: *our fathers in the wilderness*, who had the tabernacle of the testimony; and *our fathers* that were with Joshua, who in their turn brought it into the possession of the Gentiles. I am disposed to think the older version is right in taking *κατάσχεσις* to mean simply *a possession*, as in v. 5, and not *entering upon a possession*: *εἰσάγειν* had probably acquired a technical meaning of installing a prince or an heir in his inheritance, and so takes *ἐν* instead of *εἰς* after it.

viii. 46. The word *tabernacle* in the older version introduces a confusion with the former tabernacle; the word *habitation* in the Revised does not express so distinctly as *σκήνωμα*, the temporary nature of this dwelling place which David asked for, as contrasted with the *house* which Solomon built. The later prayer of David for a house is not here alluded to, because it did not receive fulfilment till his son’s time.

vii. 51. Our versions read “*uncircumcised in heart and ears*.” I suspect that *καρδίας* is the true reading, and that it was changed into *καρδίαις* in some MSS. with a view to so rendering the passage. But, supposing the dative to be genuine, it would be as inelegant to write this sentence as it stands in Greek, as to write in English “*uncircumcised in heart and in your ears*.” The stop must surely be placed after *καρδίαις*, and *καὶ τοῖς ὥστιν* be taken as the beginning of the next clause: “*Even with your ears ye do always . . .*” Their fathers had refused to listen to Moses, and they were now stopping their ears against the voice of the Spirit, and setting themselves to silence it by violence; they had reached herein a climax of stubborn unbelief, even beyond what was expressed in an uncircumcised heart.

I miss in many places the graphic touch of Greek present

and imperfect tenses. iii. 2 (*ἐβαστάζετο*) The lame man was being carried as Peter and John were going up. iv. 2 (*διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν . . .*) The rulers were sore troubled that they were teaching the people and proclaiming . . . ; the special trouble consisted in the persistent continuance of the Apostles' teaching. iv. 21 (*ἔδόξαζον*) The rulers could find no way to punish the Apostles for fear of the people, because all were glorifying God . . . v. 5 (*ἀκούων*) Ananias was struck down before Peter had done speaking; as he heard, he fell down. Again, *τ. ἀκούοντας* must be the actual hearers of the words, "all them that heard," not those that heard it afterwards. vii. 41 (*εὐφραίνοντο*) The people were rejoicing in their idol, when Moses appeared to interrupt their festival.

Many valuable amendments, required to bring the English version into accordance with the Greek text, must be sought in the margin of the Revised Version.

ii. 28. *μετὰ τ. προσώπου σου*, in Thy presence.

προσώπου clearly implies that the gladness will consist in standing in God's presence.

ii. 33, iii. 15. *οὗ* must obviously be masculine, "of whom."

iv. 9. *ἐν τίνι*, in whom.

The two questions asked were, in what power, and in what name, they had wrought; both pointed distinctly to a person in whom the healing virtue resided, and the answer takes full advantage of this opening to preach Jesus Christ.

iii. 22, vii. 37. *ώς ἐμέ*, as He raised me up.

The Greek can scarcely bear any other translation.

iv. 24. *σὺ ὁ ποιήσας*, thou art he that made.

vi. 2. *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, minister to tables.

διακονεῖν has a special significance in this chapter, and conveys an obvious contrast between the daily ministration of food and the ministry of the Word.

THE PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH LII., LIII.¹

MEN are so accustomed to read the Scriptures in the light of their own peculiar creed that it is often difficult to comprehend how differently Biblical passages may be interpreted by persons of another faith. It is, therefore, not surprising that Christians in general should find it hard to understand how pious Jews can peruse the 53rd of Isaiah without seeing that its predictions have been accomplished in the sufferings of the Son of man.

The believer in Christ, however, cannot fail to attain a deeper comprehension of "the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1) by seeking honestly to understand the difficulties of the Jew. A fuller comprehension of the significance of the great prediction of Isaiah will lead him to exclaim, "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past tracing out!" (Rom. xi. 33.) It will inspire him also with a deeper sympathy for that people who are the kinsmen of Christ according to the flesh, and, perhaps, assist in leading some of them to understand "the mystery of Christ," whose "gospel" was designed to be "the power of God unto salvation to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. i. 16).

The title "servant of Jahveh" (or, when Jahveh Himself speaks in His own person, "My servant") is frequently employed to designate Moses, the great lawgiver (Deut. xxxiv. 5 and throughout the Book of Joshua, etc.) ; Joshua, the victorious captain (Josh. xxiv. 29) ; David (Ps. xviii. 1 ;

¹ The following article was delivered as a sermon before the University of Oxford on March 4th, 1888, at the annual lecture on "the Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy," founded by the late Dr. Macbride, Principal of Magdalen Hall (now Hertford College), Oxford. It was necessary, however, in order to avoid undue length, to omit in delivery several passages which are here given.

xxxvi. 1, etc.; Jer. xxxiii. 21, etc.); Job (ch. i. 8; ii. 3; xlvi. 8); and other heroes of the Old Testament. It is applied in a lower sense to Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon (Jer. xxvii. 6), and to other conquerors whom the Lord used as instruments to execute His wrath.

In the second portion of the Book of Isaiah (ch. xl.-lxvi.) that expression is employed in three distinct significations. It is used of all Israel, the "Israel according to the flesh," sometimes even in passages where the nation is severely blamed for its blindness and hardness of heart, in spite of its solemn professions of allegiance to Jahveh (ch. xlvi. 18, 19).¹ It is used of the faithful in the nation, the "Israel according to the spirit" (ch. xliv. 1, 2). Lastly, it is employed to indicate the great personal Servant of Jahveh, the Messiah (ch. xlix. 5, 6), who is distinguished from the people to whom He belongs, and in the midst of whom He works. As Delitzsch has well observed, "the conception of the servant of Jahveh is as it were a pyramid, whose base is the people of Israel as a whole, whose centre is Israel according to the spirit, and whose apex is the person of the Mediator of salvation who arises out of Israel."

We purpose on the present occasion to survey the explanations current among the Jews, especially in pre-Christian times, of the great prophecy which speaks of the

¹ It is utterly preposterous to refer such a passage as Isaiah xlvi. 18, 19, to Christ, although such an exposition is given in many of our popular commentaries. The student should consult especially the commentaries of Delitzsch and Cheyne upon the passage in question, in which the absurdity of such an exegesis is exposed. But it is difficult to make the crooked straight, or to get persons once accustomed to such expositions out of the ruts into which they have once fallen. It is really sad to see how many passages are perverted, and how even those who ought to know better have stuck fast in the thick mire of tradition. Thus the passage in Zech. xiii. 6, which refers to the self-inflicted wounds of a miserable idolator, mad on his idols, is still persistently referred by some to the wounds of Christ on the cross. See my *Bampton Lectures on Zech.*, pp. 426 ff. The latter is a case in which popular evangelical hymns have unduly warped the mind. Men, as Archbishop Whately often noted, claim to have the command over words, but words often in reality get the command over them.

Suffering Servant of Jahveh in the character of the Sin-bearer (Isa. lii. 13—liii.). Such a survey will lead us to see that the prophecy was an enigma, which could not be understood in the days before Christ, but which has been solved by the sufferings, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Him who was the Son of man and the Son of God.

The earliest reference to this special prophecy of Isaiah is to be found perhaps in Daniel xii. 3, “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.” The phrase “turn many to righteousness” is in the Hebrew closely akin to the clause in Isaiah liii. 11, “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many,” or “procure righteousness for many,” “make many righteous.”¹ The connexion of the phraseology used by Daniel with that employed in Isaiah has been generally recognised by the best critics. The difference between the two passages is that in Daniel the plural is employed, in Isaiah the singular. The difference is significant, but, even if it be granted that the passage in Daniel is based on that of Isaiah, it does not by any means follow that the allusion in the Book of Daniel is to be regarded as explanatory of the former. We are not warranted in drawing the conclusion that Daniel identified the faithful teachers of whom he speaks, who after days of tribulation were to attain to glory, with the righteous Servant of Isaiah, although the latter is similarly represented after days of sore distress as receiving his just recompense of reward.

Scholars are fully aware that the LXX. translation of the Hebrew Scriptures is, in many respects, like the Targums, a commentary on the sacred text. Hence it would be im-

¹ Compare the phrase in Daniel, **צדיק צדיק וצדיקי הרים**, with Isa. liii. 11. The occurrence in both passages of the hiphil of **צדך** combined with the mention of **הרים** “the many,” which is such an important word in the latter passage, can scarcely be fortuitous.

portant, if possible, to discover the interpretation which the LXX. put upon the prophecy in Isaiah lii., liii. The LXX. translators considered the 42nd chapter of Isaiah (almost universally regarded by the ancient interpreters as Messianic) to refer to the nation of Israel. In the opening verse of that chapter, they have with the freedom of paraphrasts introduced the names "Jacob" and "Israel" as explanatory severally of the titles used, "My servant," and "My chosen."¹ No such explanatory gloss has, however, been introduced into any part of the 52nd and 53rd chapters. But an examination, however, of the LXX. rendering of that prophecy leaves us in the dark as to the interpretation they put upon its terms. Much of it might, indeed, fairly be interpreted in a Messianic sense, and was actually so expounded by Philip in his discourse with the eunuch. But there are clauses in the Greek version which can scarcely bear such a meaning, and which lead us to suspect that the translators themselves were more than ordinarily perplexed as to the sense of the prophecy.

The Book of Wisdom contains several allusions to the prophecy of Isaiah liii. That apocryphal work, too little read and studied in the present day, was probably composed about a century prior to the Christian era, and abounds in passages of considerable force and beauty. One of its striking peculiarities is, that although it teems with references to persons and places noted in patriarchal and Israelitish history, and abounds in quotations from the Sacred Writings, all mention of proper names, or of books, is carefully avoided. The name of Israel does not occur in the book,

¹ Luther took a similar liberty in introducing the name Christ into his German translation of Daniel ix. 25, 26. And in our ordinary English Bibles supposed to be (though very erroneously) "without note or comment," we have many a similar instance in the headings of the chapters and pages. Thus we have Jeremiah xxxi. 22 erroneously stated as a passage in which "Christ is promised," although the Biblical student knows full well that the miraculous incarnation of our Lord is not there alluded to.

although that nation is distinctly alluded to under such designations as "thine own people," "thy sons," "the holy nation," etc.

The author of the Book of Wisdom has copiously introduced into his work phraseology borrowed from the second portion of the Book of Isaiah. The references specially made to the prediction respecting the Suffering Servant of Jahveh are numerous enough to enable us to see the general lines of his interpretation.

The writer introduces the wicked as saying :

"Therefore let us lie in wait for the righteous one,	ch. ii. 12.
He professeth to have the knowledge of God	ii. 13.
And he calleth himself the child of the Lord. ¹	"
Let us see if his words be true,	ii. 17.
And let us try what things will happen in his end,	"
For if the just be a son of God ²	ii. 18,
He will help him and deliver him from the hands	
of his enemies.	"
Let us examine him with insult and torture,	ii. 19.
That we may know his meekness,	"
And test his patience.	"
Let us condemn him to a shameful death,	ii. 20.
Then according to His own words there shall be	
respect of Him.	"
Such things did they think and went astray, ³	ii. 21.
For their own wickedness blinded them.	"
And they knew not the mysteries of God, ⁴	ii. 22.

¹ παῖδα Κυρίου; compare ὁ παῖς μον in Isaiah lii. 13. We cannot, however, render the phrase in the Book of Wisdom as "servant of the Lord," because παῖς is in so many passages of that book used interchangeably with ριός. See chaps. ix. 4, 7; xii. 19-21, etc. But the παῖς Κυρίου of the LXX. corresponds to the Heb. בָּנָן דָּבָר. The same uncertainty prevails in the N.T. passages (Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). In consequence of the references made in the context of those passages to the sufferings of Christ, of which the apostles had themselves just learned the real significance, the Revised Version has rendered the phrase τὸν παῖδα αὐτῶν Ἰησοῦν, etc., "his servant Jesus," with a reference in the margin to Isaiah lii. liii., while the Auth. Vers. less suggestively has rendered "his holy child Jesus."

² Gr. ριός Θεοῦ.

³ Greek εἰλογίσαντο καὶ ἐπλανήθησαν. Compare the use of λογίζομαι in the LXX. of Isaiah liii. 3, 4, 12; and πλαναόμαι in Isaiah liii. 6.

⁴ Μετρήμα Θεοῦ, the secret counsels of God, like Heb. דִּבְרֵי in Psalm xxv. 14,

Nor hoped for the wages of holiness,¹ ii. 22.
 Nor deemed that there was a reward for blameless souls."²"

Speaking later concerning the sufferings of the righteous, the author says of God :

" As gold in the furnace hath He tested them, ch. iii. 6.
 He has received them as the whole-offering for a sacrifice ; "

They shall judge nations, and shall subdue peoples, iii. 8.
 And their Lord shall reign for ever."

They that have trusted in Him shall understand truth,³ iii. 9.

And the faithful in love shall abide with Him."

* * * * *

But though a righteous man be overtaken by death, he shall be at rest. iv. 7.

For honourable age is not the long-timed, iv. 8.
 Nor is it measured by the number of years."

* * * * *

Having become pleasing to God he was loved, iv. 10.
 And (while) living among sinners he was translated.⁴"

He was snatched away⁵ lest wickedness might change his understanding,⁶ iv. 11.

Or guile deceive his soul."

Having been perfected in a short time he fulfilled a long time, iv. 13.

For his soul was pleasing to the Lord ; iv. 14.

Wherefore He hastened [him] away from the midst of wickedness."

etc.; compare the N.T. use of the plural expression in 1 Cor. iv. 1; Matt. xiii. 11; or of the sing. in Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 4, 9; Col. i. 26; ii. 2, etc.

¹ Contrast 2 Pet. ii. 12.

² Greek ἀμώμων, compare in reference to the righteous (Eph. i. 4; v. 27; Col. i. 22; Rev. xiv. 5); and in reference to Christ (Heb. ix. 14 and 1 Pet. i. 19).

³ Gr. συνήσουσιν ἀλήθειαν; compare *iδον συνήσει ὡ παῖς μον* in Isaiah lii. 13.

⁴ Gr. μετερέθη, the phrase is constantly used in reference to the translation of Enoch, compare Sir. xliv. 16; Heb. xi. 5.

⁵ Gr. ἤρπαγη; compare Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2; also καὶ ἤρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν Οεὺν in Apoc. xii. 5. The primary reference here in the Book of Wisdom is to Enoch, but compare also, *quoad sensum*, Isaiah lii. 8 in the LXX.

⁶ Gr. σύνεσιν, see previous note ³.

Further on the writer represents the wicked as recognising their folly at last, and speaking thus of the righteous :

" We, the fools, esteemed ¹ his life madness,	ch. v. 4.
And his end dishonourable. ²	"
How is he reckoned amoung the sons of God, ³	v. 5.
And among the holy is his lot." ⁴	"

It is no wonder that a portion of this remarkable passage from the Book of Wisdom was in early times regarded by several of the Fathers (as Tertullian, Origen, and Augustine), as a distinct prophecy of Christ. It is also natural that such an exposition should have been popular in later times with Roman Catholic theologians. It has been defended even by able Protestant interpreters like Rudolf Stier. These remarkable coincidences, between the trials of the righteous man in the Book of Wisdom and the incidents of our Lord's earthly career, have also led some critics to maintain that the book itself was written subsequent to the Christian era.

But a more careful examination of the details in question is sufficient to refute such hasty assumptions. The untenable nature of such a theory, has not only been exposed by Grimm, but is also fully pointed out by Deane in his excellent edition of that book.⁵ Both scholars have also refuted the ingenious theory of Noack, advocated among us by Dean Plumptre, which would ascribe the composition of the work to Apollos.

"The righteous" one of the Book of Wisdom is throughout a collective designation for the pious in all ages. The

¹ ἐλογισάμεθα, compare previous note³, p. 368.

² ἄπιμοι, compare τὸ εἰδός ἀντοῦ ἄπιμοι, Isa. liii. 2.

³ πῶς κατελογίσθη ἐν νοῖς Θεοῦ.

⁴ ἐν ἀγίοις ὁ κλῆρος αὐτοῦ; compare ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη, Isa. liii. 12, and with the ὁ κλῆρος, the LXX. translation αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλούς of Isaiah liii. 11.

⁵ See C. L. W. Grimm in the *Kurzgefr. exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T.*: Leipzig, 1860. W. J. Deane: *The Book of Wisdom*, Greek, Latin, and English, with comm., etc.; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1881.

ideal which the writer had in his own mind is one which, as he does not fail to point out, has been realised, more or less perfectly, in the individuals whose lives and actions are not obscurely glanced at, although all names are carefully suppressed. In the passage already cited, Enoch's short life, the testimony given concerning him in the LXX. translation, that "he pleased God" (Gen. v. 22, 24), and his final translation, are all included in the description of "the righteous one." In refutation of the theory of the Christian origin of the book, it is sufficient to note that the enemies of the righteous one are represented throughout as light-minded lovers of the world, and seekers after pleasure; while the enemies whom our Lord encountered were for the most part the chief priests and the Pharisees. The Book of Wisdom teaches the immortality of the righteous, but not their resurrection. Christianity is, however, inseparably bound up with the fact of the resurrection of Christ, and with the doctrine of the resurrection itself. The death of the righteous one is ascribed in the Book of Wisdom to the eagerness of the wicked to test his meekness by some crucial experiment, and thus to bring to light his concealed hypocrisy. The translation of the righteous one after a short life on earth is, in accordance with the doctrine of Isaiah lvii. 1, described as a blessing, inasmuch as he was thereby removed from out of temptation (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 9), under which he might finally have succumbed. And though the notion that the death of the righteous may be a sacrifice once crosses the writer's mind, there is "not the slightest allusion made to the atoning power of the sufferings and death of the righteous one" (*Grimm*).

These points are conclusive against the notion that the work referred to was the composition of a Christian. It is, however, certain that in several places the writer had in view the prophecy of Isaiah lii., liii. In the description of the righteous one he makes use (as we have seen) of its

phraseology. But his "eyes were holden" that he saw not therein the marvellous picture of the Suffering Messiah. In the *πτᾶς κυρίου* (the servant of the Lord) of that passage he saw only a delineation of "the Israel after the spirit." He did not regard the prophecy as Messianic.

In the other books of the Alexandrian canon, commonly known as the Apocrypha, no distinct allusion can be traced to the prophecy of the Great Sufferer. The perusal of those books exhibits rather the dying away of the Messianic expectations which filled the hearts of the Israelites or Jews when they returned out of exile to the land of promise. The great Maccabean chieftains were members of the priestly tribe of Levi, and in the day of their success were unwilling to remain in the position of "Judges of Israel." It seemed beneath them to assume the *rôle* merely of an Eli and a Samuel. They aspired to a higher place, and assumed first the position of high priests, and afterwards that of kings. Simon, the last of the gallant band of the five brethren, combined in his person the office of high priest, which he inherited from his brother Jonathan (1 Macc. xiv. 30), with that of prince (1 Macc. xiv. 41). In occupying that position he seems to have been conscious of acting in a manner opposed to the Messianic predictions, according to which the throne of Israel was reserved for the house of David. Hence "the Jews and priests" added to their solemn declaration of their acceptance of Simon as "prince and high priest for ever," the saving clause, "until there should arise a trustworthy," or "reliable prophet (*προφήτην πιστόν*)," because such a prophet was expected to announce the advent of Messiah the Son of David. Strange that the Jews in the day of liberty forgot the sign given by Zechariah, the greatest of the prophets of the Restoration, when he prophesied that "the Branch" which should shoot up from the house of David should "bear the glory," and "sit and rule upon his throne" and be "a priest upon

his throne" (Zech. vi. 12, 13). The crown of the priesthood and that of the kingdom could not be lawfully worn by any individual but the long-expected Messiah.

The unlawful union thus cemented between the offices of high priest and king resulted in the decay of the Messianic hope. The "trustworthy prophet," not Messiah himself, was henceforth the real object of expectation. The Elijah predicted by the prophet Malachi was looked for, in place of the Branch of the House of David. Kings not themselves of the house of David were not pleased to hear that they, or their children, would have to vacate the throne for a scion of a fallen house. Hence the brilliant writer of those days, Jesus the Son of Sirach (or Ben Sira as we prefer to call him), in his eulogies on the memory of righteous men, ignores the Messianic hopes of the prophets of Israel. But he does not forget to recall to mind the great deeds of Elijah, or the hopes which centred round that prophet. Elijah, according to him, is one "who was written of," or "enrolled (*καταγραφεῖς*) in warnings for special times,"¹ namely, in the warnings uttered by Malachi and Isaiah concerning the season preceding the day of the Lord. Ben Sira had in view not only the "warnings" of Malachi, but also the prophecy of Isaiah in chap. xlix. 6 concerning "the Servant of Jahveh." He ventures to unite the latter with that of Malachi as if it referred to one and the same person. He asserts that Elijah's future work would be (1) "to pacify wrath before fury (*i.e.* to still God's wrath ere it breaks out into fury) and to turn the heart of father to son, and (2) to restore the tribes of Israel" (Eeclus. xlviii. 10). He thus assigned to Elijah a work which was peculiar to "the Servant of Jahveh" or Messiah.²

¹ The translation "ordained for reproofs in their times" (A.V.) misses the true sense of the passage.

² See Dr. G. H. Dalman's very important work, though it is small in extent (pp. 100), *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrtausend* (Berlin, 1888), which is a reprint of several articles in

Thus had the Messiah as the great object of expectation faded from the hearts of the Jewish writers of the post-Maccabean era. The prophecies concerning "the Servant of Jahveh," his sufferings and victory, were interpreted of the sufferings of the righteous, and of their ultimate reward.

The elevation of the priesthood to political power was followed by the increase of irreligion. The form of piety remained, but its spirit had departed. Retribution followed hard in the train of apostasy from God. The nations, or heathen around, began again "mighty to oppress the children of Israel." The hereditary rulers increased in wickedness and cruelty. The holy city became a place of massacre. The priest-kings were deposed; Pompey profaned the sanctuary; and the cursed Idumean race became rulers of the land.

But in that day of sorrow and affliction, the inhabitants of the land began to learn righteousness. The voice of penitence and of prayer was once more heard in its borders. The pious began to express their feelings in penitential psalms. The prophecies of the ancient Hebrew seers were again listened to—those prophecies which spoke of a Deliverer who should spring forth from the old trunk of the tree of Jesse.

In eighteen Psalms (extant only in Hellenistic Greek, but strongly indicative of a Hebrew original), we have a picture of the revived hopes of the pious in Judah. Those Psalms, known by the incongruous title of "the Psalter of Solomon," were probably composed at this era. The profanation of the sanctuary by Pompey, and the retribution meted out to that conqueror on the sands of Alexandria, is not obscurely pointed at in the second of those Psalms.

Prof. Dr. H. L. Strack's interesting magazine *Nathanael* (1886, 1887), a journal specially designed for friendly controversy with Jews. We have derived many suggestions from Dr. Dalman's work.

In the Psalter in question, Messiah and his kingdom once more became prominent. His righteousness was the theme of the poet. "A righteous king" himself (Ps. xvii. 35), Messiah will purify his people. "He will know them that they are all the sons of their God" (xvii. 30). He "will not permit injustice to lodge in their midst, and no man that knows evil will dwell with them" (xvii. 29). He will judge the nations and purify Jerusalem (xvii. 31). "Pure from sin," he will extirpate sinners by the power of his word (xvii. 41). Messiah will divide out the land to the people according to their tribes (xvii. 30) when they shall have been made righteous.

But in that beautiful Psalm not a syllable is spoken about a suffering Messiah. Its doctrine is, however, far in advance of that taught in the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach. There are references to the chapters in Isaiah (xlvi. and xlix.) which speak of the acts of "the Servant of Jahveh." The cheering promise of Isaiah that "He shall not fail nor be discouraged" (chap. xlvi. 4), is re-echoed, and explained of Messiah, just as in the Targum. Twice in the Psalm rings out the cry, "He shall not be weak" (*οὐκ ἀσθενήσει, vv. 42, 43*). Nor will Messiah permit his people to remain weak: "He shall feed the flock of the Lord in faith and righteousness, and shall not let weakness (*οὐκ ἀφήσει ἀσθενῆσαι ἐν αὐτοῖς*) be among them in their pasture" (v. 45; comp. Zech. xii. 8). But there are no indications to show that the thought ever crossed the mind of the pious singers of that day that Messiah should atone by His sufferings for the sins of His people, or that they regarded the sufferings so forcibly described in Isaiah lii. liii., to be those of the Lord's Anointed.¹

¹ It is possible that a reference to Isaiah liii. may be detected in the language of Psalm viii. 28: "The holy ones of the Lord are like lambs in innocence in their midst," i.e. of the nations of the earth. But if the writer alludes there to any Old Testament prophecy it is rather to Ezekiel xxxiv. The Book of Enoch (chap. xc. 6) describes the pious heroes who fell in the Maccabean struggles

In the great controversy carried on with the Jews as to the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth during the two first centuries of the Christian era many passages in the Prophets of Israel were admitted on both sides to be Messianic. The reference of other passages to the Messiah were stoutly denied; while in some cases Jewish opinion seems to have been greatly divided. Thus in the writings of Justin Martyr we read that even the Messianic character of the passages in Isaiah xlii. and xlix. was called in question by the Jews. There is unfortunately much uncertainty as to the exposition then current among the Jews of Isaiah lii. liii. For while Justin Martyr frequently adduces the passage as a prediction of Messiah, and does not represent Trypho, as in other cases, as disputing that interpretation, he does not distinctly assert that the Jews interpreted it in that manner. Trypho, when overcome in argument, confesses, no doubt, the Messianic character of the prophecy (*Dial. with Trypho*, 36, 89). But no argument can be drawn from such admissions as to the Jewish belief on the subject.

It is no marvel that Israel did not know (Rom. x. 19). If the twelve apostles did not comprehend the meaning of Christ's words when He spoke to them of His approaching sufferings and death, and "the saying was hid from them," and they perceived not the things that were said" (Luke xviii. 34), it is, surely, less surprising that the people of Israel in general did not understand the words of the prophet concerning the Sin-bearer. The life, and acts, and voice of the Great Prophet Himself were necessary to teach the lesson that "Messiah ought to suffer these things, and then to enter into His glory" (Luke xxiv. 26). But before He came in person men were in doubt of whom the pro-

under the symbol of lambs. Therefore if Isaiah liii. be referred to in Psalm viii. 28, it would rather show that the writer understood the prophet to speak of the pious in Israel.

phet spake, and shrank back in horror from the thought that “the Leprous One” of Isaiah was none other than the Christ of God.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT.

(*To be continued.*)

THE MEDIATOR-ARGUMENT OF GAL. III. 19, 20.

THERE are three conditions that appear to us to form a good preliminary test of every offered interpretation of this passage, and we should fain see them applied with all the rigour and consistency of an “Ockham’s razor.” In the first place, Does the interpretation preserve the internal unity of the passage? In the second place, does it pay scrupulous regard to the writer’s aim and object—to the point he wishes to establish? And, in the third place, is it such as to be in perfect harmony with other parts of the reasoning—both coming after and preceding? We do not know if these conditions have ever before been distinctly formulated, but, once enunciated, they commend themselves by their simplicity and their reasonableness; and, if a strict application of them were made to current interpretations, the number of competitors would soon be reduced to a manageable compass. No interpretation ought to be allowed a claim on our attention that transgresses any one of them: every such transgression should be regarded as a sin of the first magnitude, for which no extra merits—however great and fascinating—can really compensate or make atonement.

Let us, then, consider these conditions for a little; and let us take them in conjunction with the interpretation here preferred. And, first, let us inquire, What is the connexion between the members of our text—how do the various clauses stand related? This inquiry should not detain us

long. For, plainly, the passage occurs in the second part of an argument that is concerned with the Law and the Gospel, viewing both as covenants or contracts; and verse 20, standing at the very end of that part and being introduced by δέ, is to be taken along with the clause immediately preceding it. In other words, a certain conclusion has to be reached; verse 20 is the intervening step between this conclusion and the proposition, “Ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.”

What then *is* this conclusion? for that is the important question, and it is there that we first meet with difficulty. In answer, it is commonly affirmed,—that the Apostle wants to prove his thesis of the 17th verse, and that the Mediator-argument is the proof of it. In this view, we are debarred from regarding the reasoning that succeeds verse 17 as progressive, as advancing the general argument step by step; we are simply to look upon it as cumulative, so much evidence all bearing upon one and the same point—all going to prove that the law cannot disannul the Gospel. But nothing, in our opinion, could be wider of the mark, and nothing has so conducted to far-fetched and fantastic theories. The bearing of the Mediator-argument on the thesis of verse 17 (and we emphasize it) is only *indirect*; its *primary* object (as is clearly shown by the participle διαταγέσις—wrongly translated in the English version, “*And it was ordained*”) is, to support the positions of verse 19. Verse 17 lays down that the Law cannot abrogate the promise; verse 19 takes up the converse and maintains that the promise, when fulfilled, supersedes the Law: manifestly, two entirely different, though related, things. Verse 19 asserts: (1) That the Law was an *addition* to the promise (or “it was *superadded*,” if we accept the reading προσετέθη); (2) That it was added *because of transgressions*; and (3) that it was intended only for a *temporary* purpose. Now these clearly were assertions that needed to be *proved*.

—they could not be quietly taken for granted; and the last of them (being the very point at issue between the Judaizing Galatians and the Apostle) would be most keenly contested, and, if left unsupported, would appear to be nothing less than a begging of the whole question—a *petitio principii*. The problem then for the commentator at this stage is,—What interpretation of the passage will yield the desired conclusion? what interpretation will prove, that “because of transgressions the Law was superadded, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made”? We submit the following.

That the Law was an addition, is a simple fact of history; it was “ordained through angels” (end of ver. 19), in the hand of Mediator-Moses. Again, that it was “added because of transgressions”—*i.e.* for the purpose of *creating* transgressions, of bringing sin into bold relief and of carrying it home as *παράβασις* to the heart of the sinner—is evident (*ib.*) from the circumstances under which it was delivered. The ministering angels and the mediating Moses prove *that*; for, when “the Lord came from Sinai, with ten thousands of saints,” and ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ (Deut. xxxiii. 2, *Sept.*), we read that “all the people that was in the camp trembled” (Exod. xix. 16), “and they said unto Moses (Exod. xx. 19), Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die,” and (Deut. v. 5) “I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid.” And, lastly (*v.* 20), that it was limited, provisional, and evanescent is demonstrated thus:—Moses (*ὁ μεσίτης*) was the internuntius for Israel, and for Israel alone. His covenant had reference simply to the Jews; it never contemplated the whole human race as included under it; it could not rise to the conception of Jew and Gentile together forming “the one seed” of Abraham: hence ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν. The Gospel, on the other hand, “pre-announced

to Abraham" and "confirmed before of God in Christ," took a much wider sweep than this, and it looked forward to a time when not Israel alone but "all nations" should be blessed; when, therefore, there should be one God (*ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς*) to the human family, one to Jew and Gentile equally. But what is this but saying that, when that time arrived, the Jewish mediator and his functions would cease? There would then be no use for them: the special party for whom Moses mediated would not as formerly stand alone, separated from the rest of the world; the Jews would become merged in the one great community under the one great Head, and would be simply heirs, along with others, of the promise and of the inheritance.¹

This, it appears to us, is the Apostle's meaning, when fully drawn out; and most beautifully does it suit the two first of our conditions. On the one hand, it has due respect to the relation and dependence of the parts in the reasoning; and, on the other hand, it is an affirmative answer to the question in dispute, Was the Law but temporary? was it really an addition and not rather the fulfilment of the promise? was it ever intended to wax old, or to be superseded? Let us now see if it conforms to the third. Is it in harmony with the other parts of the demonstration?

¹ It will be observed that in this interpretation we regard *ὁ μεσίτης* as a synonym for *Moses*, and we think that it ought to be translated "*the mediator*," not "*a mediator*." At the same time, even supposing we accepted the generic rendering ("*a mediator*"), it would still be possible to attain the same result as above in so far as the interpretation of *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἐστιν* is concerned, *viz.* through the intercalated proposition, that the sole objects of a mediator's care are those for whom he mediates. In that case, the argument would run thus:—A mediator has reference to the parties (always two at least) between whom he mediates; *and, as mediator, he is concerned with no one else*. Now, in the case of Moses, *he* mediated between God and Israel; which just means that the Mosaic covenant referred to Israel, and, of men, to them solely. The Gospel, on the other hand, etc.

It is further to be observed that on this interpretation the *ἐρῶς* of v. 20 may be regarded either as masculine or as neuter. If it be neuter, then we supply *σπέρματος*, and it refers back to the *ἐν σπέρμα* of v. 16, and forward to the *τοῦ Αβραὰμ σπέρμα* of v. 29; if it be masculine, then the parallel is *εἰς ἐστε* of v. 28.

Certainly it is,—most fully. For, in the first place, the promise to Abraham, on which St. Paul has insisted from the sixth verse and onwards, was a promise of a *universal* blessing: “in thee shall all nations be blessed.” In the next place, it is in thorough agreement with the argument in v. 16, where the Apostle lays stress upon the circumstance that Abraham’s seed is spoken of as “one” (*éph’ ériōs*), not “many.” And, last of all, it is a necessary step in the onward march of the discussion; it is the natural passage to a consideration of the Law’s function as pedagogue, and it paves the way for the great climax of the sequel,—“In Him there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Indeed, in the light of this explanation, the whole chapter is seen to be one grand *connected* dissertation on *éνότης* and *ένωσις*. There is no longer the anomaly of a single word (*éis*) being translated in three different ways within the compass of a few verses; being taken now for numerical unity, now for unchangeableness, now for identity of privilege: but, in each and every case, the meaning attached to it is the same. By this view, full homogeneity is given to the three members—*one* seed, *one* God, *one* people (a people one in sin—“the whole,” *τὰ πάντα*, v. 22, being included; and one in redemption—“ye are all one in Christ Jesus”); and the parallelism (which we cannot but regard as intended) is kept intact, between the oneness of God in v. 20 (*οὐ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἐστιν*) and the oneness (same word) of the redeemed in v. 28 (*πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*).

But is it sufficient, in order to establish an interpretation, merely to be able to show that it meets all the requirements of the case—that it conforms fully to theforesaid conditions? Manifestly not; for it is conceivable that more interpretations may do this than one—more than one key may fit the lock,—and then how are we to decide between

them? We look upon interpretations of obscure passages in Scripture much in the same way as we look upon hypotheses in Logic, and we think both ought to be governed by the same laws. Logicians tell us that no hypothesis is valid unless it both explain the phenomena under investigation and also be supported by evidence *aliunde*. Scripture interpretations, in like manner, must not only solve the difficulty for which they were called into existence, but must further be established by considerations *ab extra*. Now, are there any *ab extra* considerations that can be produced in favour of the above interpretation? We think there are.

1. In the first place, that interpretation is in thorough keeping with the teaching of St. Paul in general—with the view of Christianity that, as Apostle of the Gentiles, it was his particular function to enforce. It shows Galatians iii. 20 to be a veritable echo of that voice which we first hear in the Acts of the Apostles—a voice that swells and grows as it proceeds, that gains in clearness and in power as it passes from one epistle to another,—that God “hath made of one ($\epsilon\xi\ \acute{e}v\circ\varsigma$) all nations, . . . that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us: for in Him we live and move and have our being.” And, in particular, it is in striking unison with the teaching of the Romans—a letter dealing with the very subject of the Galatians and probably written about the same time. We would almost challenge any one to read the third and fourth chapters of Romans in close connection with Galatians iii. and not feel that, whatever is the meaning in the one place, the same must be the meaning in the other. The train of reasoning is obviously identical in both, and identical are many of the arguments and illustrations.

2. But, in the next place, our interpretation has the merit of giving to the expression “God is one” ($\delta\ \delta\acute{e}\ \Theta\acute{e}\circ\varsigma\ \acute{e}\iota\varsigma\ \acute{e}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$) the same rendering that it gets in corresponding

passages of the Pauline writings. We have already referred to Romans iii. Verses 29 and 30 are specially in point. It is there argued, “Is He the God of the Jews only? is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God ($\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \epsilon\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\bar{\sigma}\ \bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\varsigma}$) which shall justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith.” In this place at any rate, no interpretation of the $\epsilon\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\bar{\sigma}\ \bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\varsigma}$ is admissible but that which makes it equivalent to “one and the same God”—a God the same to Gentile as to Jew. Parallel to this is 1 Timothy ii. 5. St. Paul is there counselling that prayer be made for ALL men, on the ground that “God our Saviour will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.” He then supports his last position by the pregnant consideration, “For there is one God ($\epsilon\bar{\imath}\bar{\imath}\bar{\sigma}\ \gamma\bar{\alpha}\bar{p}\ \bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\varsigma}$), and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” “One God,” he says—one, *i.e.* to the heathen ruler and to the Christians ruled, one to men of every rank and situation, one to mankind in general; and, furthermore, humanity has one, and one only, Saviour. Now we would simply ask, What interpretation of Galatians iii. 20 can afford to overlook this passage? And we would submit that *that* interpretation has the greatest claim upon us that fits into the passage most naturally and most easily.

3. Thirdly, it may not be out of place to remark on the resemblance between the Mediator-argument as above interpreted and certain parts of the last speech of St. Stephen; a speech that in all likelihood St. Paul heard, and that probably was in his mind when he wrote the Galatians—that, at all events, shows striking points of coincidence which it is scarcely practicable to ignore. St. Stephen (in Acts vii.), when introducing Moses, does so as one prophesying of the coming Saviour: “A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me; Him shall ye hear.” And, immediately there-

after, he emphasizes Moses' own position as the guide of the early Jewish Church and as the early Church's mediator: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us." He then passes to the Tabernacle erected by the Mediator and to its successor the Temple, and from this leaps direct to the grand and comprehensive thought that neither Mediator-Moses nor Moses' tabernacle was adequate to represent the fulness of the Gospel blessing: "Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is My throne and earth is My footstool: what house will ye build Me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of My rest? Hath not My hand made all these things?" This train of thought is certainly remarkable, and it bears a striking similarity to that before us. St. Paul too reasons on the Mediator-Moses; St. Paul too makes the very same leap: Mediator-Moses dealt with Jews only, God is wider than the Jews and includes the Gentiles. Yea, and St. Stephen's teaching would exactly bear out St. Paul's conclusion; it would demonstrate that the Law was only temporary and evanescent. And, as matter of fact, we find that this was how his opponents actually understood it. "They suborned men," we read (*Acts vi. 11-14*), "which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God. . . . This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us."

4. Once more, our interpretation avoids certain inconsistencies that are often very patent in others, and that ought of themselves, where they exist, to create a suspicion that the interpreter has somewhere erred. Need we refer

again to the handling that the single word *eis* has commonly received? Three different significations have sometimes been assigned to it within the range of these few verses, and it is the rarest thing imaginable to find an interpretation that is content with less than two. But, further, we observe that there is often an inconsistency hinging on the term *o μεσίτης*, and one that seems to us to be of a very grave kind indeed. Translate *o μεσίτης* (as is usually done) *generically*, and you need not thereby (as we said in the footnote) surrender the proper meaning of *o δὲ Θεὸς eis*, but you do something equally outrageous: you make St. Paul reason in a most remarkable and curious fashion. You make him first maintain that the Gospel is distinguished from the Law by its not requiring a mediator, (and what becomes of 1 Timothy ii. 5 then? what becomes of the teaching of the Hebrews, particularly of chap. viii.? yea, what becomes of Christianity itself?) and, then, by translating *ἐνώς οὐκ ἔστιν* (as you needs must do) by “not of one party, but of two,” you make him forget that the original promise (in which “God is one,” *o Θεὸς eis ἔστιν*), *being confirmed to Abraham and his seed*, had as much reference to *two parties* as the Law had. In short, you reduce the logical acumen of the Apostle to a minimum, and by a single stroke thrust him from the lofty intellectual pedestal on which for centuries he has nobly stood. Accept, on the other hand, *o μεσίτης* as the equivalent of *Moses*, and these consequences and these difficulties are avoided. St. Paul is then seen to be thoroughly consistent, and his reasoning throughout to be logically exact and to the point.

Now, putting all these considerations together, we do not think that any other interpretation can boast of a phalanx of stronger *aliunde*-evidence than this, and none seems better fitted to stand the ordeal of a strict preliminary

testing. At any rate, it is an interpretation that appears to us to merit a closer and more careful inspection than it has yet received ; and we should rejoice to see it thoroughly argued and examined by competent scholars, who would handle the subject with impartiality, having, as Locke happily expresses it, “an equal indifference to all truth.”

WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON.

THE CHIEF PAULINE NAMES FOR CHRIST.

In reading through the Pauline Epistles with a special aim in view, I have found it needful to mark by the way the most frequent designations given to our Lord, to enumerate and to classify them. The results of this side-study present considerable food for reflection, and I have thought it worth while to put them in tabular form for the convenience of others. The subjoined table forms the substance of this contribution. I have ventured to add a few remarks by way of explaining the chart and also by way of calling attention to some of its more important statistics.

1. I have followed Westcott and Hort’s text (edition 1881) in every case, not heeding the brackets in the body of the text, nor the alternative readings suggested in the margin.

2. I use the word Pauline as a convenient adjective to describe all those epistles (excepting that to the Hebrews) which have been rightly or wrongly ascribed to Paul. I venture to think that the figures contained in the table may help to throw some light on the question of authorship in the case of certain epistles : as I shall indicate later.

3. The epistles are tabulated, in the main, in chronological order.

4. The application of the term *κύριος* to Jesus is the chief if not the sole essential in the early Christian confession, as

• NAMES OF JESUS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Jesus is Called	1 Thessalonians,	2 Thessalonians,	Galatians,	1 Corinthian,	2 Corinthian,	Romans,	Philippians,	Colossians,	Kephisians,	1 Timothy,	2 Timothy,	Fitus,	Total.			
<i>κίριψος</i>	3) 8	4) 6	1) 2	10) 21	2) 8	6) 14	5) 13	1) 3	1) 7	3) 12	0	0) 4	36) 98			
{ uncertain	5) 5	2) 2	1) 1	11) 21	6) 6	8) 8	8) 2	6) 7	6) 7	9) 9	4) 4	0	62) 62			
<i>δὲ κίριψος</i>	2) 2	3) 3	1) 1	13) 1	4) 13	5) 7	2) 2	2) 2	6) 6	4) 7	0	1) 10	39) 97			
{ uncertain	7) 9	7) 7	0) 0	17) 30	9) 9	2) 2	0) 0	4) 4	0) 0	3) 7	0	9) 9	58) 58			
<i>ὁ κύριός γε μᾶν</i>	7)	6)	2)	11)	3)	12)	0)	0)	1)	5)	5	2)	0			
<i>Ιησοῦς Χριστός</i>	5) 7	9) 9	8) 8	15) 19	5) 5	17) 31	7) 7	20)	2) 5	7) 16	2) 14	1) 13	78) 165			
<i>Χριστός Ιησοῦς</i>	2) 7	0) 9	7) 7	7) 19	3) 3	14) 14	13) 13	3) 3	4) 4	9) 9	12) 12	2) 4	87) 165			
<i>Ιησοῦς</i>	9)	3)	3)	7)	10)	6)	2)	1)	2)	4)	0)	0)	0			
<i>ὁ χριστός</i>	1)	1)	4)	14)	16)	9)	5)	0)	12)	23)	1)	0)	47) 47			
<i>Χριστός</i>	2)	0)	19)	30)	23)	25)	11)	3)	9)	7)	0)	0)	86) 86			
<i>νιός Θεοῦ</i>	1)	0)	4)	2)	1)	7)	0)	0)	1)	1)	0)	0)	129) 129			
<i>κίριψος</i> with cr. without additions	12) 12	13) 9)	22) 1)	4) 5	34) 28)	62)	9) 15	23) 10)	33)	7) 15	3) 5	4) 14	12) 24	5) 5	3) 16	129) 249
{ uncert.	24)	24)	22)	2)	24)	62)	15)	24)	10)	8)	2)	10)	12)	0)	13)	120) 249
<i>Ιησοῦς</i> do.	16)	12)	18)	26)	18)	37)	22)	6)	6)	20)	14)	13)	4)	212)	4)	212)
<i>Χριστός</i> do.	10)	10)	38)	63)	47)	65)	36)	8)	25)	46)	15)	13)	4)	380)	4)	380)

appears from 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9; Phil. ii. 11. But κύριος is also the name employed in Greek to denote אָדָם and יְהוָה in the O.T., and consequently it is a designation commonly used in the N.T. for the Father. This fact makes it at times exceedingly difficult to distinguish the κύριος = ὁ πατήρ and κύριος = Ἰησοῦς. Very frequently, indeed, the writer does not seem clearly to distinguish to his own mind which Person he would characterize; for in the Divine sovereignty which ruled the Church, Father and Son were to him practically identical. This absence of distinction has obliged me to make a double entry in the table in the case of the titles κύριος and ὁ κύριος. Those passages in which the reference to Jesus seems to me unmistakable, I have entered as "explicit"; those which are less definite I have marked "uncertain." The cases in which κύριος was evidently used of the O.T. יהוה or N.T. πατήρ, I have left out of count. Here—in each of the three classifications—there is room for difference of opinion, and different investigators might accordingly give different numerical results.

5. Many of the names and titles here enumerated occur in combination, but are entered separately. For example, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is entered, one under head ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν and one under head Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; and ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is entered, one under head ὁ κύριος and one under head Ἰησοῦς. But Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is only entered under Ἰησοῦς • Χριστός and not under the two heads Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός. Only when Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός occur alone or in conjunction with other words, such as κύριος, νιός, etc., are they entered under the separate heads. Similarly, ὁ κύριος is never entered under κύριος, and ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν never under ὁ κύριος or κύριος. These remarks of course do not apply to the three lowest lines of the table, which are concerned with totals and expressly defined.

I have sought carefully to distinguish between Χριστός

proper name and ὁ χριστός as common name. Hence when I have come upon the expression ὁ χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, I have made two entries,—one under head ὁ χριστός, and one under head Ἰησοῦς; while Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς would count only as one entry under head Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

6. The totals naturally arouse our attention first. Of all the designations *Xristós* is used most frequently. It occurs 129 times, whereas, counting uncertain as certain, *kúrios* occurs only 98 times. On a similarly liberal interpretation ὁ *kúrios* comes next with 97 cases. Then follow *Xristós* Ἰησοῦς (87 times), ὁ χριστός (86 times), and Ἰησοῦς *Xristós* (78 times). ὁ *kúrios* ἡμῶν comes seventh in order of frequency with 54. Ἰησοῦς alone, which is the commonest title in the Gospels, is in the Pauline Epistles the least frequent (47). Thus:—

<i>Xristós</i>	occurs	129 times.
<i>kúrios</i>	.. 36 or perhaps	98 ..
ὁ <i>kúrios</i>	.. 39 or perhaps	97 ..
<i>Xristós</i> Ἰησοῦς	..	87 ..
ὁ χριστός	..	86 ..
Ἰησοῦς <i>Xristós</i>	..	78 ..
ὁ <i>kúrios</i> ἡμῶν	..	54 ..
Ἰησοῦς	..	47 ..

7. It is to be observed that the double name Ἰησοῦς *Xristós* or *Xristós* Ἰησοῦς occurs more frequently than any other designation, viz. 165 times.

<i>Xristós</i> Ἰησοῦς, 87 }	occur	165 times.
Ἰησοῦς <i>Xristós</i> , 78 }		
<i>Xristós</i>	occurs	129 ..

8. Taking up the greater totals which are formed by counting the number of times the words occur (whether as proper or common names, whether in combination or alone), we find that

<i>Xristós</i>	occurs	380 times.
<i>kúrios</i>	.. 129 or at most	249 ..
Ἰησοῦς	..	212 ..

9. The proportion in frequency of use of *Iησοῦς* and *χριστός* which prevails in common parlance can claim Pauline precedent for itself. Thus singly *Xριστός* is used nearly three times as often as *Iησοῦς*; singly or in combination nearly twice as often.

10. It is interesting to note the various proportions of frequency of the several names in the different Epistles. Taking all the explicit and uncertain *κύριος* designations as referring to Jesus, and lumping these with the frequencies of *Iησοῦς* and *χριστός* alone or in combination to get the guiding totals, we can present in tabular form the proportion in which each of the three commonest titles (*κύριος Ιησοῦς χριστός*) with or without additions, appears in each epistle :—

IN	OCCURS	TOTAL.	THE	
				PROPORTION.
1 Thessalonians	10	: 50	=	.200
2 Thessalonians	10	: 44	=	.227
Galatians	38	: 61	=	.623
1 Corinthians	63	: 151	=	.417
2 Corinthians	47	: 89	=	.528
Romans	65	: 135	=	.481
Philippians	36	: 73	=	.493
Philemon	8	: 19	=	.421
Colossians	25	: 45	=	.555
Ephesians	46	: 90	=	.511
1 Timothy	15	: 34	=	.441
2 Timothy	13	: 42	=	.309
Titus	4	: 8	=	.500
TOTAL	380	: 841	=	.452

I have heard it stated that the use of the term *χριστός* increased in frequency as the N.T. age advanced. Now from the above table we see a rapid increase from 1 and 2 Thessalonians to Galatians, but the proportion of *χριστός* is greater in Galatians than in any of the other and later epistles. We may attribute this swollen proportion to the special polemical occasion of Galatians.

		'Ιησοῦς		
IN	OCCURS	TOTAL.	PROPORTION.	
1 Thessalonians	16	: 50	= .320	
2 Thessalonians	12	: 44	= .271	
Galatians	18	: 61	= .295	
1 Corinthians	26	: 151	= .172	
2 Corinthians	18	: 89	= .202	
Romans	37	: 135	= .274	
Philippians	22	: 73	= .301	
Philemon	6	: 19	= .315	
Colossians	6	: 45	= .133	
Ephesians	20	: 90	= .222	
1 Timothy	14	: 34	= .411	
2 Timothy	13	: 42	= .309	
Titus	4	: 8	= .500	
	—	—		
TOTAL .	212	: 841	= .252	

The high proportion in the Pastoral Epistles is very striking, but it must be borne in mind that *'Ιησοῦς Χριστός* or *Χριστὸς Ιησοῦς* is with them almost the only title in use. The case of Colossians is remarkable in the opposite direction, the proportion sinking to .133, which is .119 below average.

		<i>κύριος</i>		
IN	OCCURS	TOTAL.	PROPORTION.	
1 Thessalonians	24	: 50	= .480	
2 Thessalonians	22	: 44	= .500	
Galatians	5	: 61	= .082	
1 Corinthians	62	: 151	= .410	
2 Corinthians	24	: 89	= .269	
Romans	33	: 135	= .244	
Philippians	15	: 73	= .205	
Philemon	5	: 19	= .263	
Colossians	14	: 45	= .311	
Ephesians	24	: 90	= .266	
1 Timothy	5	: 34	= .147	
2 Timothy	16	: 42	= .381	
Titus	0	: 8	= .000	
	—	—		
TOTAL .	249	: 841	= .296	

Putting aside for a moment the remarkable leap down

in the proportion in Galatians, we notice a steady reduction in frequency of use from 1 and 2 Thessalonians to Philip-pians; then the figure rises in Colossians to above the ave-
rage. In the Pastoral Epistles the variations are striking.

Roughly to summarize these proportions, one may say that on the average, upon mention of our Lord's name, *χριστός* in one form or another would occur three out of seven times, *Ιησοῦς* one out of four times, *κύριος* more frequently than one out of four, but not so frequently as one out of three: further, that though *χριστός* averages three out of seven, it at first occurs one out of five, and later rises to more than three out of five; *κύριος* at first occurs about once out of twice, sinks to occurring only once out of twelve times, and is entirely wanting in Titus, while maintaining an average of over once out of four: the use of *Ιησοῦς*, which averages one out of four, presents no striking variation except in Colossians, where the word occurs barely over once out of nine times, and in the Pastoral Epistles, where it is used nearly once out of thrice.

11. Certain striking peculiarities in the use of these names may serve, if supported by other and weightier considera-tions, to elucidate the authorship of the Epistles in which these peculiarities occur.

(a) Is it not remarkable that in 2 Thessalonians the name *Χριστός* alone does not occur once, and ὁ *χριστός* only once? Yet these are on the whole the names most fre-quently used in Pauline Epistles.

(b) Is not the extraordinary frequency with which ὁ *χριστός* (noun with article) occurs in Ephesians specially significant? In Galatians ὁ *χριστός* occurs four times only; in Romans nine times; in 1 Corinthian fourteen times; in 2 Corinthian sixteen times; but in Ephesians it occurs twenty-three times. We cannot overlook the fact that Ephesians is much smaller than either 1 Corinthian, 2 Corinthian, or Romans, and mentions the name of the

founder (90 times as *κύριος* or *Ιησοῦς* or *χριστός*) much less frequently than Romans (135 times), and 1 Corinthians (151 times).

(c) The infrequency of *Ιησοῦς* in Colossians (six out of forty-five times) naturally excites remark. *Ιησοῦς* alone occurs only twice. Can this be taken—of course only if supported by other facts—to point to a time of composition far distant from the early gospel days, when *Ιησοῦς* was the common designation for our Lord?

(d) But the Pastoral Epistles present the most striking divergencies from the general nomenclature of Paul. 1 Timothy and Titus never use *κύριος* or *ὁ κύριος* (without *ἡμῶν*). 2 Timothy and Titus never use *ὁ χριστός*. All three epistles agree in never using the name *Ιησοῦς* alone, *Χριστός* alone, or *νιὸς Θεοῦ*. These are most important facts in regard to the question of authorship.

(e) There are, however, considerations arising out of these statistics, which require us to be cautious in using them as guides to authorship. *Kύριος* without addition, which occurs so frequently in all other Pauline Epistles, is in Galatians only once explicitly applied to Jesus; it can though with uncertainty be referred to Him in only one other case in this epistle. *Ο κύριος* is only once used, and *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν* twice. This infrequency of *κύριος*, taken together with the unparalleled frequency of *χριστός*, may be explained by the peculiar conditions under which the epistle was written. *Kύριος* was the title used of Jesus by those within His Church; the Galatians were regarded by Paul as little short of apostates, or at least as persons rather standing outside the Church and requiring to be convinced before they acknowledged the *κυριότης* of its Head. Paul, in proceeding to convince them, approaches them from the side of Israelitish history, and seeks to show how Jesus is the consummation of the O.T. order. He naturally, therefore, uses *χριστός* more frequently than any other

name (but chiefly *Xριστός*, not ὁ *χριστός*). This is an interesting example of the way in which the apparently external matter of names lies closely bound up with the inmost spiritual substance of the Epistle. A similar instance appears in the use of *vīos Θeoū*, which occurs most frequently in the great theological Epistles; in Galatians four times; and in Romans seven times.

But these variations of name-frequency in different epistles which are on all sides admitted to be from Paul's hand, forbid us making too rigid inferences from even greater deviations in the case of disputed epistles. Yet if no explanation can be found in the different occasions of the epistles in question, the difference in name-frequency is not to be set aside in discussing the authenticity of the several Pauline Scriptures.

12. Our table suggests a kind of criterion (or help to such) for the date of the origin of our gospel histories. The Pauline literature before us shows that in the earliest period of it *κύριος* and *Ιησοῦς* are the most frequent titles for our Lord; at the end of it (excluding for the nonce the Pastoral Epistles) *χριστός* is far and away the commonest; and that not merely as solemn official title, but as historical proper name. Does this Pauline literature mirror, or did it create the current nomenclature of the early Church? Then in either case we might, broadly speaking, maintain that other writings may be placed early or late accordingly, as the current name in them for our Lord is *κύριος* and *Ιησοῦς* (alone) or *χριστός*. With due caution I think this canon might help in discovering and distinguishing the dates when our evangelic narratives were written.

Take one instance. Pfleiderer maintains that Mark—which he regards as the first gospel—was written by a Paulinist, who tinged the narrative so far as he could with Pauline doctrine, and sought to vindicate from the lips of the Master the Gentile Christianity of the Gentile apostle.

Now is it likely that an author, soaked *ex hypothesi* in Pauline literature, would rarely or never slip into the use of the most frequent Pauline name for Jesus? But in Mark the term *χριστός* has its full official significance and has not become a proper name equal to *Ιησοῦς*. Only once (ix. 41) is *Xριστός* used by Mark in what is not necessarily an official sense.

The writers of our gospels were naïve and unsophisticated, and would drop most readily into the current nomenclature. To watch their use of the words *χριστός*, *κύριος*, *Ιησοῦς*, might thus lead to instructive results.

I should be glad if these tabulated statistics, along with the fragmentary notes, serve as suggestion for fresh lines of investigation more thorough and complete.

F. HERBERT STEAD.

AT THE SIGN OF THE BIBLE.

In the story of Mary's anointing the feet of Jesus at Bethany (Mark xiv. 3-9; John xii. 1-8), both gospels speak of the perfume as *μύρου γάρδου πιστικῆς*. The adjective, if it is a pure Greek word, must mean either "liquid" or "genuine." But neither alternative is free from objection, and many scholars have inclined to find in it a local designation, or possibly a commercial term of foreign origin. Following up this clue, the Rev. W. Honghton has observed that the main ingredient of spikenard, which is the unguent we have to do with, is the root of an Indian plant, which among other names is called *pisitā* in Sanskrit. He therefore suggests that the *πιστικός* of Scripture is the Greek form of a technical designation of the nard, derived from the name of this its principal and most costly constituent.

* *
*

The incident of the anointing throws a curious sidelight on our Lord's conduct in respect of almsgiving. The distribution of charity, even with every care and precaution, is not an unmixed

benefit. At best it is but the inevitable remedy of a worse evil. Nevertheless, till the roots of wrong are extracted, almsgiving is a duty. The value of the vase of perfume amounted to a considerable sum of money. The dishonest steward of the apostolic company regretted that this amount did not come into the treasury, and so under his selfish manipulation. His discontent found expression in the suggestion that it would have been a use of the offering more after Christ's heart to have sold the ointment and entrusted the price to His treasurer for distribution to the poor. Manifestly one chief destination of what went into the purse of Jesus was the liberal relief of distress. Christ was a munificent almsgiver. Indeed, here, in His very defence of the claims of personal affection, He by reversion establishes a perpetual benefaction for the unfortunate. "The poor ye have always with you, but Me ye have not always." By that declaration He makes the needy His heirs, and diverts to them the great stream of practical benevolence, that should in all ages be evoked by His love and directed towards His person.

* *

*

It is remarkable that Jesus should have made so much of Mary's tribute of almost romantic homage, and should have assigned it such a prominent place in the proclamation of the evangel. For the deed had little, if any, official significance. It was not done in public, but in the inmost circle of His closest friends and followers. In His external work and influence Jesus could not be helped by it. Value it had none, beyond its worth for His heart, as the exquisite expression of a love that words could not utter nor diffidence repress. Our Lord's impassioned vindication of the deed, and its guerdon of immortal fame, are the Divine recognition of the transcendent worth to God of human love and worship.

* *

*

We say that the motive of our Lord's redeeming life and death was love of sinful men. If we believe what we say, we mean that what carried Him through His long self-sacrifice was actual love of heart for actual men and women. Love's supreme eraving is the hunger for answering affection. Responsive, sympathetic, understanding love is to it the very breath of life and the material of new achievement. Among His disciples, in the homes of His friends,

on the mountain top, in Gethsemane, we recognise this instinctive yearning of love in Jesus. That evening in Bethany, surrounded by disciples full of earthly hopes excited by the great miracle done on Lazarus, our Lord sat with a full heart, lonely amid their loving but worldly spirits; for to His presaging mind the miracle of wonder was the warrant of His death. That this was His mood is manifest from the complexion the anointing takes in His words of commendation, which just reveal the unstudied flow of His thought and emotion. "She hath anointed My body beforehand for the burying." Was it a presentiment of this sad future that prompted Mary's loving act? And was it this solitary fellowship of sympathy in love and sorrow, that gave to her deed its unique preciousness for the heart of Jesus in that hour of grief and loneliness?

* *

*

It is perhaps true that our Lord's words (accurately rendered) do not alone afford an adequate basis for this reading of Mary's intention. But it seems to lie in the essential structure and spirit of the narrative, and to form the explanation and justification at once of its beauty and its peculiarity. Mary's attachment to our Lord was all along a uniquely sympathetic one. The disciples, wrapped in their secular and somewhat selfish thoughts of His kingdom, heard His premonitory words about His approaching death, but could not understand or believe them. The love of Mary, being more purely personal, made those words about Himself of supreme significance, while her quick sympathy with her Lord made her sensitive to the reality of that shadow of death and disaster that had settled down on His spirit, and made a chill in the sunshine of His Divine heart. So she went, and prepared for that dark day a fragrant tribute of affection, that should be sweet about the body of her dead Lord. But, perchance, she thought, if His death were one of violence, might it not be impossible for love to minister to Him then? Moreover that night her heart was too full to wait. Why keep the sweetness of her worship for the coldness and silence of death? Censurous eyes and hard hearts may misjudge her, but He will understand all she cannot say. And He is her Lord and Master. So she went and anointed Jesus "beforehand for the burying."

* *

*

An interesting contribution to the problem of the Song of Solomon has been made by Dr. Stickell, author of an able monograph on Job, but better known for many years as an expert in oriental coin-lore. He holds the book to be of early date, dramatic in structure, intended to be spoken by living actors, and the theme of it love. The new point in his treatment, which is throughout genial and instructive, is the assertion that besides the generally recognised characters we must admit a pair of lovers, a shepherd and shepherdess of Lebanon, distinct from the Shulamite maiden (who is a vinedresser) and her betrothed. This couple are introduced in three scenes, i. 7-8, i. 15-ii. 4, iv. 7-v. 1, and play their part parallel with, but quite distinct from, the action of the other personages.

* *
*

The suggestion meets some difficulties in the dramatic theory of the book, but of positive evidence there is of course not much to build upon. The objection, that two entirely unconnected movements should be presented in the same piece, is parried by the illustration of the separate but parallel treatment of two themes in a musical double fugue. And that what is done in the sister art may be attempted in drama is proved by Prof. Budde, who cites as an illustration of the precise method in question a bridal play of the Silesian poet Andreas Gryphius, in which he intertwines but does not intermingle two sets of actors and two streams of action. The possibility of Stickell's position may therefore be conceded, and even its probability, provided his general conception of the book is well founded. But skilful as is his analysis, and graceful his interpretation, he can hardly hope to have said the last word in the discussion. The enigma of the Song still waits to be solved.

* *
*

As the result of an elaborate analysis of the book of Jonah in the *Zeitschrift für die Alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft*, Prof. Boehme arrives at the conclusion that the book is certainly of composite origin. The kernel of the story is from the pen of a Jehovistic writer, with whose work there has been incorporated an Elohistic narrative, running parallel with the second half of it, and frequently diverging from it. There are besides editorial adjust-

ments and complementary additions (*e.g.* the poem) from at least one other hand.

* *
*

The theory of the union in the book of divergent versions, which has already been ably argued by Koehler and others, should it succeed in establishing itself, will have a bearing on current critical constructions of the literary origin of the piece. It would put out of court the notion that the composition is a pure theological projection or polemical allegory, in which only the names Jonah and Nineveh are borrowed from history, and would support the view, that the narrative rests on a basis of prophetic tradition, which has been made the vehicle or embodiment of great religious ideas.

* *
*

The first part of Kittel's *Geschichte der Hebräer*, in the series of handbooks of Ancient History, issued by Perthes of Gotha, has appeared. It has been preceded by Tieles treatment of Assyrian, and Wiedemann's of Egyptian history. The aim of the series is to give "a clear, connected, and precise narrative, coupled with criticism of divergent views, but free from spun-out discussions and researches." This ideal, so rarely realized even when sought, has hitherto been kept well in view; and promises to make the series one of the most useful and convenient. Dr. Kittel's contribution is written with charming simplicity and clearness, is abreast of the latest and best information, holds a middle—some people would say an opportunist—position in disputed questions, maintains its own views with moderation, and states the opinions of opponents with singular fulness and fairness.

* *
*

This opening portion carries us only to the death of Joshua, but it includes the inevitable discussion of the critical construction of the Hexateuch. The main positions of the author were already known from his essays in the *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*. In connexion with the recent statement in these pages of the opinions of Delitzsch and Dillmann, it may be of interest to give the dates assigned by our author to the chief elements of the Hexatentch. The work of the older Elohist (E) was written in the northern kingdom about B.C. 900, while the Jehovahist (J)

wrote in Judea later, say, between 830 and 800. The Priestly Code (P) contains at least three constituents of very diverse ages. There is first P¹, consisting of ancient pieces, originating in the tenth and ninth centuries; then P², the work of the proper author of this document, produced in the eighth century; to which P³, (the holiness-laws in Leviticus, etc.), was added somewhere between Hezekiah and Jeremiah. Parallel with this last contribution to P, must be reckoned the production of Deuteronomy, probably in the time of Manasseh. These several elements were worked together during or more likely subsequent to the exile. Dr. Kittel is therefore, like Dillmann, at issue with the central contention of the Graf school of critics.

* * *

It is curious to compare the dates finally fixed by Vatke, and published in his posthumous *Einleitung in das alte Testament*. The older Elohist he makes a contemporary of Isaiah (say B.C. 722). The Priestly Code he places in the last years of Hezekiah (about 700), the Jehovist between 700 and 650; the holiness-laws (Lev. xvii.-xx., etc.), about 650. These combined made the law book of Josiah, while Deuteronomy belongs to the close of the kingdom (say, between 599 and 588). Fifty years ago Vatke had anticipated and defended the late date of the Priestly legislation. In his new commentary on Genesis Delitzsch expresses astonishment at Vatke's change of front. No doubt, were the latter still with us, the feeling would be reciprocated. Evidently we are still far from having reached a condition of stable equilibrium in Old Testament controversy. It is not wonderful to find Horst concluding a criticism of the extreme (not to say wild) theories of d'Eichthal and Verne with a salutary reflection upon "the exceeding uncertainty of even those results of criticism that are to-day reckoned most certain."

W. GRAY ELMSLIE.

THE PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH LII., LIII.

THEOLOGIANS still debate the question whether the prophets of Israel recorded what they "saw," or "heard," in prophetic "vision," or committed their thoughts to writing under an influence felt to be an influence from above. The prophets "searched what time, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them" (1 Pet. i. 11). But the hearers and readers of the prophets were in a less favourable position to judge of the import of their words. They understood that a great Deliverer would come forth from David's royal line, be born in David's city, and sit upon David's throne. They believed that the second David would, like the first, deliver Israel from the hand of their enemies, subdue great nations, and reign in righteousness and peace.

But there were other "voices of the prophets," the meaning of which was not so intelligible. If the reader of Jacob's prophecy (Gen. xlix.) noted that to Judah was to belong "the obedience of the nations," he could scarcely help observing also that the promise made to the tribe of Joseph appeared grander in its import and was couched in a higher strain of poetry. He might be staggered when he compared the simplicity of the blessing pronounced by the great lawgiver on Judah (Deut. xxxiii.) with the warmth and glow of that poured out in the same poem on Joseph. Isaiah spoke of the great light springing up in Galilee of the

nations (chap. ix. 1, 2); Ephraim was styled in Jeremiah "the beloved son" of Jahveh (Jer. xxxi. 20).

There was enough in such "voices of the prophets, read every Sabbath" (Acts xiii. 27), to suggest the notion, afterwards enlarged by the fancies of tradition, that deliverance would arise out of Ephraim, as well as out of Judah. Hence the idea, afterwards more fully developed, of the two Messiahs, Messiah ben-Joseph who should precede, and Messiah ben-David who should follow after. Although that opinion was utilised in later days for controversial purposes antagonistic to Christianity, it is now acknowledged by many impartial expositors that the theory itself had its roots in traditional expositions which go back to the times before Christ.¹

To discuss satisfactorily the subject just touched upon would lead us too far away from our present theme. But it must not be forgotten that Elijah, the greatest of the prophets, was a member of the kingdom of Ephraim, that is, of Israel in the narrower signification of the name. To that prophet was assigned in prophecy the full accomplishment of the task, unsuccessfully essayed by him in the days of Ahab, that is, of turning the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers (Mal. iv. 5). He was to unite the robe once torn into twelve pieces and separated into two portions (1 Kings xi. 29-32). The longing desire of the Hebrew prophets was that the great schism should be healed, and Judah and Ephraim should again become one. But the breaches of the house of David could only be built up by national repentance.

¹ See especially Dr. G. H. Dalman's work before alluded to, and also the interesting appendix on "Messiah ben Joseph," in *The Yalkut on Zeechariah, translated with Notes and Appendices*. By Edward G. King, B.D., Hebrew Lecturer at Sidney Sussex College, and Vicar of Madingley. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1882.) Two very interesting articles on "Die Elias Sage" by K. M. Ittameier, appeared in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft und k. Leben* for 1883.

The day of suffering had to precede the day of blessing. According to a current tradition (founded on a combination of 1 Kings xix. 16, Dan. ix. 24, and Mal. iv. 5), Elijah the prophet was to anoint Messiah the Son of David. Elijah himself was an "anointed" one. He was also a Ben-Joseph. His earthly life had been passed in suffering and privation endured on behalf of Israel. Moreover he did not suffer alone, but at the head of a godly band of prophets like himself, who sought to turn back the heart of the people to their God. In vainly seeking to perform that work, they were "slain by the sword," having often gone about "in sheepskins, in goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, evil entreated (of whom the world was not worthy), wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and the holes of the earth" (Heb. xi. 37, 38).

As the enigma of Isaiah lii. liii. then presented itself to the Jews before the Christian era, and the question was asked "of whom speaketh the prophet this?" it seems to us that it was quite natural for them to seek to explain the prophecy as a summing up in one picture of the sufferings of the righteous. However unsatisfactory such a solution must now be regarded, the recognition of the fact that it was natural to seek for a solution in that direction may have no unimportant bearing upon the Jewish controversy of the present day.

The mystery of the sufferings of the righteous has always perplexed pious thinkers, even those of bygone days. Inspired writers have "by divers portions," been instructed how to alleviate the difficulty. In the great Book of Job the writer maintains, in opposition to current prejudice, that trials and sufferings are not always "signs" of Divine wrath, or the result of Divine punishment. Sufferings are, indeed, often inflicted for such purposes; but sufferings are also sent for the purification of the godly; and are, occasionally at least, permitted to occur, not so much for the

benefit of the sufferer, as for the advantage of the world, of angels, and of men, unto whom he is made a spectacle (1 Cor. iv. 9). The sufferings of Job, although ultimately beneficial to himself, for "to them that love God all things work together for good" (Rom. viii. 28), were, as the prologue of the Book of Job points out, mainly probative.

It is not surprising, therefore, that an exposition of Isaiah lii. liii. traced on such lines found favour in both pre-Christian and post-Christian times. Nor need it excite any wonder that in our own days, in which there is such a disposition to look lightly upon sin, and to view it no longer as "exceeding sinful" (Rom. vii. 13), Jewish controversialists, as in days of yore—in review of the sufferings of their nation in past times, or in sight of their continued ill-treatment—should be found ready to maintain that the theme of the prophet was the sufferings of the righteous nation of Israel, and the benefit accruing therefrom to the haughty but ignorant nations of the world.

One of the best specimens of this interpretation is found in the Treatise of the Talmud termed *Berakoth*, 5 a. It is as follows:—

"Raba said, or possibly, Rab Chisda:—If a man sees that chastisements come upon him let him, search his actions. For it is said, Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord' (Lam. iii. 40). And if he has searched and found nothing, then it (the chastisement) hangs upon neglect of the Law, for it is said, 'Blessed is the man that Thou chasatest, O Lord, and teachest out of Thy Law' (Ps. xciv. 12). And if he has attended (to that point) and not found (anything wanting), it is evident that the chastenings are from love, for it is said, 'For whom the Lord loveth He reproveth'" (Prov. iii. 12).

"Raba said. Raba Sechorah said. Rab Huna said:—Every one whom the Holy One, blessed be He! delights in, He bruises him with chastenings, for it is said 'Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, He hath put him to grief' (Isa. liii. 10)."

The objection is then suggested whether—

"It is possible [in such a case] that he [the righteous sufferer] may not receive them [the sufferings] as [proceeding] from love." The

answer is that “the teaching [or, the Scripture] says: ‘When his soul shall make a trespass offering’ [Isa. liii. 11].”

And the remark follows that in such a case there must be knowledge evinced on the part of the sufferer.

“As a trespass offering is [offered] with knowledge, so the chastenings are with knowledge. [Quest.] And if he received them (thus), what shall be his reward? [Ans.] ‘He shall see seed, he shall prolong days’ [Isa. liii. 10]. And not that only, but his doctrine shall be established ‘in his hand.’ For it is said, ‘the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand’ (Isa. liii. 10).”

But can such be the real meaning of the prophecy? Messiah is, indeed, the representative of his people, and what is said in praise of the righteous in general may in most cases be affirmed of the Righteous One. But the question is, has the pyramid which springs from earth no top that reaches towards heaven? Does the prophecy not point distinctly to one who in his own individual person should realise in the fullest sense the idea of “the servant of Jahveh”?

In the great section of Isaiah’s book which precedes the description of the great sufferer, the Servant of Jahveh is said to be made use of by Jahveh as a threshing instrument, sharp, with teeth (chap. xli. 15). One task intrusted to him is to raise up the tribes of Israel, and to restore them to their forfeited inheritance. But that task is mentioned as too light and easy a work for him. The servant is to do something grander, to become salvation unto the ends of the earth (chap. xlix. 6). Great however as this work is, the servant of Jahveh is “despised,” like many of the prophets before him. “Abhorred by a nation,”¹ he becomes even “a servant of despots”² (chap. xlix. 7). His labour is for a

¹ The Heb. נָא is without the article. Yet it is not so indefinite in meaning as “a nation” would imply. It is probably without the article to indicate almost the same as *mankind*, i.e. neither Jews nor Gentiles considered specifically as such. See the notes of Delitzsch and Cheyne.

² This is the sense of בְּשָׂרֵב, heathen tyrants being probably signified.

time in vain, his strength is spent for nought and vanity (chap. xl ix. 4). He has his moments of discouragement. But his mouth is like a sharp sword, and he like an arrow hidden in Jahveh's quiver (chap. xl ix. 2). In due season that "polished arrow" shall be shot forth as "the arrow of Jahveh's deliverance" (2 Kings xiii. 17). For, filled with the spirit of Jahveh, the Servant is to persevere until his work is accomplished. It is said of Jahveh that "He shall feed His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs in His arms, and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead them that give suck" (chap. xl. 11); and it is also recorded of the Servant that he will similarly seek for those that are gone astray. "A crushed reed shall he not break, and the dim-burning wick shall he not quench" (chap. xl ii. 3). Though discouraged, "he shall not burn dimly, neither shall he be utterly crushed, till he have set judgment in the earth, for the isles are waiting for his law" (chap. xl ii. 4).¹ In vain the enemies pursue His people, exclaiming in their pride: "I will pursue, overtake, destroy" (Exod. xv. 9). Their "chariots and horse, army and hero" (Isa. xl iii. 17), are brought forth, though they know it not (Ezek. xxxviii. 4), by Jahveh that He may get Him honour over their might and their pride. "They lie down together," overwhelmed by "the mighty waters," "they cannot rise, they are quenched like a wick" (Isa. xl iii. 17).²

But through those same "mighty waters," Israel is led safely, though they be "a sea of trouble" (Zech. x. 11). A path is prepared for them in the sea. When they pass through the waters, Jahveh is with them; when they walk

¹ It is important for the purpose of comparison with the verse following, and of noticing the contrast set forth in chap. xl iii. 17, to carefully observe here the expressions רצין קָרְבָּנָה בְּהַלְּאַנְכִּי, and יְכַפֵּת בְּשָׁפֶת. Hence our attempt to preserve the uniformity of expression in English.

² The reference to the overthrow of the Egyptians at the Red Sea is unmistakable. A strong argument in favour of the high antiquity of the Pentateuch could be constructed from a careful induction of all such incidental references to its history in the Prophets of Israel.

through the fire, the flame does not kindle upon them (Isa. xliii. 2). The wilderness is transformed before them, rivers appear suddenly in the desert, shady trees spring up in all directions (chap. xli. 17-20); and Jahveh answers the prayer of His Servant, who has "to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel." "Kings see and arise; princes, and they worship, because of Jahveh, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel who had chosen Him" (chap. xlix. 6-8).

Such is a rapid glance at what may be seen represented in the outer courts of this wondrous temple of prophecy. The representation given of "the Servant" is evidently of One higher and holier than the "Israel according to the spirit." "The Servant" is in Israel, of Israel, and yet separated from Israel. He is sometimes hidden among his people, and his personality is concealed, but his own individual importance and his special work, ever and anon, start forth again prominently into view.

But we have to enter the innermost shrine of the prophecy, the holiest of all where the work of reconciliation is pourtrayed. On the very threshold we hear the outburst of praise and thanksgiving (Isa. lii. 7-12). There is a cry of joy on the mountains around Jerusalem announcing peace and redemption. The kingdom has come, Jahveh has returned to His people—Jahveh is king! His holy arm is bared—"all the ends of the earth," and not merely Israel, have seen the salvation of God. The shout of salvation is followed by a cry of warning to the unholy—"Depart ye, depart"—the priests must become clean, the peoples must be sanctified. Jahveh Himself proceeds in front, before His people. They that follow after must ride "upon white horses, clothed in fine linen pure and white" (Rev. xix. 14). Jahveh goes also behind His people, to protect them on every side, for He is their rear-guard.

The prophetic declaration, written over the portal of the

innermost shrine, is to the effect that the Servant "deals wisely;¹ he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high" (chap. lii. 13). But the sight that meets the view on entering is of a very different character. The image of the Servant is all disfigurement. "Marred more than any man" is too great a softening down of the picture presented in the original. The appearance of the Servant of Jahveh is so fearfully disfigured, that it is no longer that of a man. His form does not appear like the sons of men.² Many shrink back appalled from the sight. He is despised, and forsaken by men—a man of sorrows (full of pain), well-acquainted with sickness! At his appearance his fellows cover their faces with disgust. They regard him as "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." Leprous in appearance, he is shunned; like a leper he is avoided. The reference to that awful plague is unmistakeable, and when the question is asked in the Talmud of Babylon, "what is the name of Messiah?" the reply directly given is "The Leprous One," although "those of the house of Rabbi" [Judah the Holy] preferred to give a less terrible answer,

¹ This translation is affirmed to be "a mistake" by Dr. S. M. Schiller-Szinessy in his "*Exposition of Isaiah lii. 13, 14, 15, and liii. delivered before the Council of the Senate in the Law School on Friday, April 28th, 1882*," Cambridge, 1882. The learned Rabbi asserts p. 9 that "לִפְנֵי" occurs in three places in the Bible besides here, and in none of those places does it mean: he shall, or he will, or he does, deal prudently. It means: to be successful, to prosper, and so also the Targum renders it חַלְצָא." But such criticism is quite misleading. It is true that the 3rd per. sing. impf. of this conj. of the verb only occurs in four passages, inclusive of Isaiah lii. 13. But surely that fact is of no importance, seeing that other persons of the impf. and of the perfect occur frequently, and are used in the sense assigned to the verb in the Auth. Vers. One can scarcely imagine how such a criticism can be meant seriously. The Messianic reference, however, does not depend upon the rendering one way or other.

² The original indicates here very plainly that his countenance was disfigured to such a degree as to be no longer like that of a man. The form קֹשֶׁת may no doubt, regarded from a grammatical standpoint, be variously explained. But it is certain that the explanation of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, who regards it as standing "simply for נִשְׁבָּת, deteriorated, corrupted, destroyed, the past of the Niph'al being used participially here," will not be accepted by any scientific grammarians.

and simply quoted the text: “As it is said ‘Surely he hath borne our sicknesses.’” (*Sanhedrin*, 98 b).¹

Repentant Israel in the days in which, as described by another prophet, they shall mourn for “the Pierced” One “as one mourneth for his only son” (Zech. xii. 10), are represented as bitterly sorrowing over past ignorance and blindness in the following terms: “Who believed that which we heard? and the arm of Jahveh unto whom was it revealed?” That which we saw was a “mystery” too deep for us to comprehend. Jahveh’s holy arm had to be made bare, ere we could understand Jahveh’s “secret.”² For the Servant grew up before Him, under His protection, “as a tender plant, as a root out of a dry ground; he had no (personal) beauty or (royal) majesty, and if we looked on him, there was no appearance that we should desire him” (chap. liii. 1-3).

Those who thus speak are not the Gentiles—the nations of the earth. The Gentiles and their kings are “startled”³

¹ See the text of this passage and the notes thereon in the valuable work, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*. 2 vols. I. Texts edited from Printed Books and MSS. by Ad. Neubauer. II. Translations by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer, with Introd. by Rev. E. B. Pusey. Oxford and London, 1877.

² Note the connexion between Isaiah lii. 10 and Isaiah liii. 1, and both in relation to the doctrine of Psalm xxv. 14.

³ We must again set aside Dr. Schiller-Szinessy’s unique rendering of Isaiah lii. 15 “so shall he attract great nations.” Even if the rendering be retained “so shall he sprinkle many nations,” it would be absurd to refer it to baptism. But that is not the usual “Christian” interpretation, as Dr. Schiller-Szinessy seems to suppose. It is more usual to explain the passage by reference to the sprinkling of blood on the mercy seat by the high priest on the Day of Atonement, or of the water of purification on the leper. There is much in favour of the latter view, as it would coincide with the reference to the stricken leper in ch. liii. 4 (יְנַפֵּר) and in ch. liii. 8 (יְנַפֵּר). The verb is often used in that sense. But the difficulty is, the verb is never connected, as in this passage, with a simple accus. of the person sprinkled. If we could, as Cheyne observes, after “sprinkle” insert the words “his blood upon” before “many nations,” the passage would refer to the sacerdotal office of “the Servant.” But as the text stands, we must, however, with the majority of critics, render the word as in the margin of the Revised Version, by “startle,” i.e. make to leap with astonishment. See Delitzsch on the passage.

and confounded when the Servant takes to himself the kingdom and assumes the position which is rightly his. They shut their mouths in awe at his superior dignity, "For that which had not been told them they shall see ; and that which they had not heard shall they understand" (iii. 15). For the Hebrew prophets were not sent to the Gentiles. It was for Israel's enlightenment that those teachers were raised up and commissioned from on high. But they to whom the message of salvation was sent accepted not the message. The ears of Israel were heavy, and they understood not the preaching ; their eyes were closed, so that they saw not the visions sent to their prophets from the Most High.

Late in time the arm of Jahveh is manifested. The "mystery" is unfolded to Israel, the "secret" is revealed. "The seed of Jacob" are overwhelmed with sorrow. They acknowledge their sin and short-sightedness, and, as they recall the sight once beheld by them,—the sight of "the Leprous One,"—they exclaim :

" Surely it was our sicknesses he took up, and our pains, he bore them ; and we regarded him one stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted ! And HE, wounded on account of our transgressions! crushed¹ on account of our iniquities! the punishment of our peace (*i.e.* punishment tending to our peace) was upon him ! and through his stripes we have been healed !! All we like a flock did go astray, we turned each to his own way ; and Jahveh made to light down upon him the iniquity of us all !" (chap. liii. 4-6).

Such is the penitential wailing—not now that of the "daughters of Jerusalem" only, but of the whole house of Israel. "They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will Jahveh lead them" (Jer. xxxi. 9) to acknowledge their guilt and shame.

But the sound of wailing ceases, and the Prophet narrates himself the sufferings of the great Servant—

¹ נִפְלַע Comp. v. 10, and also by way of contrast the use of the word in Jer. xliv. 10.

"He is oppressed (as by slave-drivers),¹ and he let himself be humbled,² and opens not his mouth; as the sheep led to the slaughter; and as a ewe before her shearers dumb, and opens not his mouth. Through oppression and through a judgment (a judicial sentence) he was taken away—and as for his generation (*i.e.* those who lived in his day), who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of My people a stroke was upon him!³ And one assigned his grave with the wicked, and with a rich man⁴ in his martyr-deaths,⁵ although he had done no violence neither was any deceit in his mouth" (lili. 7-9).

Lastly, the Prophet, having thus sketched vividly the sinless conduct and the cruel sufferings of the Servant of Jahveh, distinctly unfolds the Divine purpose in permitting those sufferings; and then finally declares, like the Psalmist of old, the Divine decree touching the ultimate exaltation of the Sufferer.

¹ נִפְרַא. Compare the use of this verb in reference to taskmasters and slave-drivers, Exod. iii. 7; Job iii. 18.

² See Delitzsch's note on the syntax in the 3rd edit. of his commentary.

³ There has been much discussion on the question whether לֹא can be regarded as singular. Cheyne and Delitzsch decide in the affirmative (see the critical note of the former). They are led to this decision chiefly by the context. If the passage were only regarded from a grammatical point of view, it would be easier to regard the suffix as plural: "for the transgression of My people they were stricken." But the general Messianic interpretation would be in nowise imperilled by the acceptance even of this alternative rendering.

⁴ Many critics regard the word וְאֶת־עָשָׂיר as a collective corresponding to the word אֶת־רַשִׁים of the previous sentence. But there is a decided difficulty in this view. If the two words were intended to have been exactly parallel the plural might have been easily employed. The expression "the poor" is unquestionably often used in the Psalms as synonymous with "the righteous," but there is no clear case on the other side, that is, of "the rich" being used distinctly for "the wicked." On the other hand, the difficulty of regarding the second clause, to be contrasted with the former lies in the facts, (1) that in such a case we should have expected נִגְרָא, and (2) that it is most natural to regard the second clause as closely connected with the former, thus: "and one assigned his grave with the rich in his death." Some critics with Ewald would, therefore, correct the text. The text as it stands agrees strikingly with the facts recorded in the Gospels, although there is not a word there said "that the Scripture might be fulfilled." See our remarks on the passage on p. 418.

⁵ בְּמִתְהָיו. The plural is perhaps best regarded with Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 353) as emphatic, denoting violent death, or martyr-death. Cheyne would prefer simply to read בְּמִתְהוּ, in his death (sing.). I agree with Cheyne that the reading בְּמִתְהָיו "in his tomb" is very doubtful, for it is very questionable whether בְּמִתְהָ can mean a tomb. And the difficulty of the plural still remains,

"And Jahveh was pleased to crush him! He afflicted him with sickness!¹ If a guilt-offering his soul should make,² he would see a seed,³ he would prolong days, and the pleasure of Jahveh would prosper in his hand. After the travail of his soul⁴ he would see, be satisfied.

"By his knowledge shall My Righteous Servant make the many righteous, and their iniquities shall HE bear. Therefore I assign him a portion among the many,⁵ and with the strong shall he assign the

¹ The form of the verb is somewhat irregular, but it has been satisfactorily explained in Kautzsch's *Gesenius Gr.*, § 75, rem. 17. It is unnecessary to change the pointing, as recommended by several critics. The expression, of course, must be understood figuratively, whether the prophecy be explained of Israel, the prophets, or the Messiah. The superficial objection of the Jews that such statements cannot refer to Christ, because it is nowhere said in the Gospels that He endured sickness, is undeserving of serious reply. Note, however, our remarks on p. 416.

² Compare, with Cheyne, *τιθέναι τὴν ψυχήν*, John x. 11. The difference between the "sin-offering" (*תְּנִפְחָה*) and the "trespass-offering" or "guilt-offering" (*מֵטָאת*) must be duly noted. As Delitzsch observes, the idea at the root of the *חַלְלָה*, or the whole burnt offering, is (*oblatio*) the presentation of adoration; of the *בְּנִימָלֵט*, that of (*conciliatio*) peace or friendship; of the *בְּנִחְנָה*, that of a *gift* presented to God (*donatio*); of the *תְּנִפְחָה*, sin-offering, expiation (*expiatio*), such as it is for instance presented in v. 5; and of the *מֵטָאת*, *satisfaction*, restitution (*muletta, satisfactio*). The work of the Servant of Jahveh comprehends all these several ideas. See Delitzsch's note. It is unwise to import into the discussion of the prophecy any considerations drawn from theories adopted concerning the age of the Pentateuch, such as that "the distinction between a sin-offering and guilt-offering was not very clearly drawn when the prophet wrote."

³ It is important to observe that the original is not "his seed." The common objection of the Jewish controversialists to the application to Christ is thus most easily met. See the *Chizzuk Emunah* of R. Yizchak, edited by Rabbi D. Deutsch (Sohrau i O.-Schl. 1865), in which it is contended against Dr. A. McCaul that disciples might be styled sons (*בָּנִים*), but never (*בָּנָי*) a seed. But Cheyne's reference to Psalm xxii. 30—"a seed shall serve him"—is conclusive. Dr. Pusey refers, in proof of the figurative use of "seed," to Isaiah i. 4; lvii. 4. But this can be retorted, see Deutsch, p. 380. Mal. ii. 15 is almost a better reference. Dr. Schiller-Szivesy (p. 25), while maintaining that "seed can only mean actual and material progeny," considers the absence of the personal suffix fatal to the Jewish objection. We cannot coincide, however, with the latter scholar in introducing an understood relative into the next clause, making it mean "a generation 'which shall prolong days.'" The introduction of the relative is quite out of place, although countenanced by the transl. of the LXX., Vulg., and Targ.

⁴ Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 359) regards the *וְנִצְחָה*, here and in the preceding verse as reflexive, "himself." But the rendering is very doubtful. We see a deeper significance in the expression.

⁵ We must insist on the uniform translation of *רְبִיבָּה* throughout the prophecy. It is used without the article in chap. lii. 14, chap. liii. 12, at end;

portion of the spoil, because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, and he took up the sin of many, and for the transgressors makes intercessiou”¹ (chap. liii. 10-12).

Such a prophecy, regarded as a whole, whatever may be affirmed of a few of its clauses, cannot be interpreted of Israel—whether the Israel after the flesh, or the Israel after the spirit. Few interpreters are now hardy enough to maintain the former exposition. Many have essayed to uphold the latter. But in order to give a show of plausibility to such an exposition, the most important statements must be glossed over. The doctrine of vicarious suffering is too strongly imprinted on the passage to permit of its being eradicated without an utter destruction of the prophecy itself. The sufferings of the Jewish race were not vicarious, though “the fall of the Jew has been the riches of the world and their loss the richness of the Gentiles” (Rom. xi. 12). The voice of the Hebrew lawgiver, the voices of the Hebrew prophets, all with one accord proclaim the solemn fact that the sufferings endured by that unhappy nation have been the consequence of their sins. We rejoice not in those sufferings. Nay we look forward with longing to the day when the reception back of the Jewish or Israelitish race into Divine favour shall be “life from the dead” to the world at large (Rom. xii. 15).

But the bold assertion that the great prophecy, of which

with the article in chap. liii. 11, and in the early portion of v. 12. Also as qualifying “nations” in chap. iii. 14. St. Paul’s use of *οἱ πολλοὶ*, *the many*, in Rom. vi. 15-19, gives the true key to the meaning of the prophecy.

¹ Briggs renders “and for transgressors interposes,” which he explains by “acts as substitute.” He does not approve of the idea that the passage speaks of the “priestly intercession of Christ, which is contrary to the theme of the entire piece, which sets forth the victim and not the priest.” We cannot coincide with this view. **לִפְנֵי הָעָם** cannot be used here in the same sense as in verse 6. It has the sense of “interceding” in Jeremiah xv. 11. We have not to make the statements of the prophecy, but simply to interpret them. It appears to us most suitable and most beautiful that the last mention made of the Sufferer in the passage should be that he intercedes for the transgressors. We decline even to change the tense as is done in the Revised Version.

we have given a sketch, "may be consistently applied to Israel as represented by the pious in his midst, culminating in the Messiah"¹ depends entirely upon the assumption that the five opening verses of chap. liii. describe "the speech of the nations and kings of heathendom." That interpretation is, however, almost impossible. The Jewish race can in no proper sense be regarded as the most despicable and oppressed of all nations. Nor could an inspired writer in the days of our prophet (whether the author was Isaiah of Jerusalem who lived prior to the exile, or some "Great Unknown" who lived posterior to that era) have thus painted his nation. It is incorrect to assert that "it is the righteous Israelite only, culminating in the Messiah, that has suffered both outwardly and inwardly: outwardly because he conformed not to the heathen majority, and inwardly because he, the firstborn of God, the ever and deeply feeling heart of the human race, deplored the erring of the world which went after idols various."² The Jewish people have, indeed, endured fearful and unjust oppression. That oppression has, however, not been occasioned in general by any bold protest made by Jews against idolatry. The Jews scattered among the nations have not sought to turn the nations from idolatry. Too often the real explanation of the cruel wrongs of the Jew has been the greed for gold on the part of their Gentile oppressors. Oppressed by the Gentiles, the Jews have too often learned to oppress the Gentiles in turn. The wish to be free from the payment of extravagant usury, the desire to wipe off at the expense of a traditional foe debts recklessly incurred, as well as "the love of money" which "is a root of all kinds of evils" (1 Tim. vi. 10), have been the real motives which have prompted designing men to excite Christian fanaticism against the Jewish people.

¹ Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, *Exposition*, p. 29.

² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Religion has been but the stalking horse on which covetousness has ridden forth to massacre.

In no case, however, could the nations be represented as affirming even of the pious in Israel under such sorrows (often inflicted upon the innocent and noble) : "the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his being wounded healing was given to us." The cruel Gentiles have had themselves to suffer for the injuries inflicted on the Jew. No wholesale injustice (so often perpetrated in such persecutions) has been permitted to pass unavenged by the God who rules over human history. There is a day of judgment coming for the wrongs committed by individual transgressors; but peoples suffer for their crimes in this world. "There is no day of judgment for nations."

The picture presented in the holy of holies of this prophecy is, however, a sadder one than even that of the sufferings of the Jew. The picture is symbolical, but oh ! how real. It is easy to trace there the lineaments of Jesus of Nazareth. His humble origin from a fallen house, from a lowly family. From the old felled tree of Jesse, "the shoot" springs up out of the long-neglected stump. He deals wisely. What wisdom the very concealment of His Divinity from the eyes of the sons of men ? He was not the God merely "veiled in flesh." The incarnation was real, not merely external. The Divinity communicated itself to the humanity, as the latter was able to bear it. There was a veritable emptying of Himself (Phil. ii. 7), a true "exinanition," as theologians have termed it. The equality with the Divine was not "a thing to be grasped at" (Phil. ii. 6). "Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man" (Luke ii. 52). He was little, and he grew in size—He was ignorant, and He advanced in knowledge. He grew in favour with God; for every step was sinless and perfect,—the shoot, the bud, the flower. "Perfect man," He "learned obedience by the things

which He suffered" (Heb. v. 8). Made capable of intellectual and spiritual, as well as of bodily growth, He was at last "made perfect," and became unto all them that obey Him the author of everlasting salvation" (Heb. v. 9).

But though He grew in favour in some respects with man, how was He the Sinless One treated? The existence of a Sinless One excited hatred and not love in the breasts of those to whom His very existence was a standing reproof. His best security lay in retirement. So unknown, save to a small circle, some of whom loved Him, most of whom disliked Him, none of whom understood Him, "the Chosen One" of Jahveh passed the mysterious time of infancy, childhood, boyhood, and early manhood. He came forth from His obscurity to walk up and down in the land that was His own (John i. 11)—belonging to Him by a more solemn covenant than ever made with Abraham. "His own people received Him not" (John i. 11). He taught them, and He healed their sick; not, too, without suffering, if we can venture to touch on so solemn a theme. "Virtue went out of Him" (Luke viii. 46). Was He none the weaker? Did Jehovah not literally make Him sick? Note the wondrous reference in the Gospel of St. Matthew (the passage is not quoted from the LXX.), where, after recording Christ's healing influence, it is said, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases'" (Matt. viii. 17). He was at least once defiled with ceremonial impurity when He put forth His hand and touched the unclean leper.

But pass over such scenes as these, and fix your attention on the close. There He stands! *Ecce homo!* Condemned by the highest ecclesiastical council, at an extraordinary midnight session, and—of the crime of blasphemy. The Holy One is accused and sentenced for impiety. He who claimed to be the Son of God was condemned by those who were the Divine representatives on earth, as guilty of the

most terrible sin. "He was made sin for us" (2 Cor. v. 21). Beaten, buffeted, reviled, and spat upon. Dragged before the civil tribunal He was there acknowledged innocent, but not set free. Placed at the bar of a second judge, a king, He was, on account of His silence, "led as a lamb to the slaughter, like a ewe dumb before her shearers." He was mocked, set at nought. Placed once more at the tribunal of His former judge, He was scourged (no doubt in the hope of exciting the sympathy of the mob), dressed in mockery in a cast-off soldier's garment, crowned with thorns. The cries of the multitude demand His execution; and the unjust judge, after vainly trying to divest himself of the responsibility of the crime, gave sentence against Him on the charge of rebellion and of usurpation of the rights and title which belonged to Caesar.

From the standpoint of the Biblical student, we cannot affect admiration for any one of the many pictures of the Christ on His way to the cross. Art has felt herself compelled to throw a veil over the grosser indignities of the scene. The Redeemer's face itself must have been sadly disfigured. The strokes which had fallen on the Sacred Head caused it to present externally rather the appearance of the stricken Leper of Isaiah, than the majestic countenance art delights to paint. If the awful reality could be delineated on canvas, men would even now turn their faces away, appalled at such a sight. The picture is too revolting to be set forth in its dread reality. But in softening down the horrors of the scene, art has unwittingly done much to keep alive the Apollinarian heresy, which—though nominally relegated to the lumber-room of forgotten heresies—is in reality one of the most widely-spread delusions of modern times. The true doctrine of the incarnation, set forth in the much-abused "Athanasian creed," is too little comprehended by Christians in general. But if formulated bravely and boldly, and "in language understood of the

people," it would do much to lessen some of the difficulties of modern belief, and to roll away stones of stumbling from the feet of the Jewish people.

We pass over in silence the deep sorrows of Gethsemane, and do not venture to watch that awful hour with the Redeemer. How "crushed" He was in that sad vigil no mortal can conceive. The solemn words of the prophet: "It pleased Jahveh to crush him," may be regarded almost as an answer to the "strong crying and tears," which found utterance in the prayer: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done."

The scene on Golgotha, too, we do not venture to depict, or to point out how it coincides with the prophecy. The prophetic cry of "the Elijah that was to come," long ago expounded all in one verse: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" (John i. 29.)

Lightly the Roman judge assigned Him in his original decree, "a grave with the wicked," for, condemned as a malefactor, His body would naturally have been cast into the grave with the malefactors who were crucified with him. The parallelism of the Hebrew verse would lead easily to the conclusion, that "the rich man" in the following sentence ought to be explained as corresponding to "the wicked men" of the first member of the verse. But no satisfactory proofs have been assigned to show that the expression "the rich" is really synonymous with "the wicked."¹ The verse is unique. We do not venture to condemn those critics who take the view alluded to as unorthodox, and we distinctly maintain that the prophecy would have been sufficiently fulfilled, if not one word had been said about Christ's burial in the Gospels. But with

¹ See note 4, p. 411. We would, however, direct attention to a remarkable article taking this view in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* for 1887, written by an orthodox scholar, Pastor J. H. Findeisen.

the incidents which accompanied our Lord's burial full in view, and the significant fact of the consignment of the Redeemer's body to the rich man's grave, we see distinct indications of Providence, which, although not recorded as fulfilments of prophecy, seem to us to point back to "the glorious passional" of Isaiah liii. For it ought not to be forgotten that our Lord was committed to the grave of Joseph by Pilate's special permission and decree. Without such a decree the bodies even of the malefactors could not have been removed from the cross on which they hung. Although, therefore, prior to the fulfilment of the prophecy it would have been better to have regarded the "rich" as a synonym for the "wicked," with "the light of the cross" shed back upon the prophecy, it is more natural to explain it as we have done.

But "it is finished." The cross has been endured. The reward has been gained. The Redeemer, who before Gethsemane pleaded for His people, who on the cross prayed for His murderers, when raised from the dead sent back a message of salvation. The Prophet has gone up on high. The atonement has been made. The blood has been sprinkled on the mercy-seat. The Priest is now on His throne. He to whom "all power is given in heaven and earth," who has all "knowledge," and can "justify" those that believe in Him, still carries on His work as "the Priest behind the veil." "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27). But the golden bells are ringing, fastened to His High-priestly robe (Exod. xxxix. 25, 26), and soon the once Suffering Servant, the now exalted King, will draw aside the curtain, and, victorious Himself, will summon His people, made victorious by His grace, to receive the High-priestly blessing :—

"Jahveh bless thee, and keep thee: Jahveh make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: Jahveh

lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."—*Num.* vi. 24–26.

"Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—*Matt.* xxv. 34.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT.

THE LANGUAGE USED BY THE APOSTLES.

DR. ALEXANDER ROBERTS's recent volume, *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles*, is an excellent example of the service that may be done to New Testament criticism by continuous, we may almost say, life-long devotion to a single problem. He has collected with remarkable diligence every scrap of evidence bearing on the question. He has put forward his arguments with great candour and fairness; and maintains a tone of unvarying courtesy towards opponents, even where he is compelled to regard their views as inconsistent or extravagant. But it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he has at times encumbered his main contention by elaborate demonstrations of facts, which few would be found to dispute; and that, on the other hand, he has strained the faith of his readers by pushing inferences beyond the warrant of facts in the interests of the extreme form of his theory. It is manifestly unfair to pick holes here and there in a series of arguments which derive much of their force from their cumulative character. But at the same time it is impossible to deal adequately within narrow limits with those parts of his work which derive such cogency as they may possess from theories still strongly contested. For this reason a general estimate of his volume may be left for other critics or for some other occasion. The purpose

of the present paper is simply to examine the force of the arguments drawn from the Acts of the Apostles. We are here free from all the difficulties raised by such questions as the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels, or the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the persons to whom it was addressed. We are dealing with a work to which sober criticism assigns an early date, and which, by universal admission, at least contains a large amount of contemporary record inextricably embedded in the text. We can hardly find surer ground on which to stand in our examination of a question which is at least primarily of historical and not of controversial interest.

Let us define precisely the point at which Dr. Roberts parts company with the great majority of contemporary scholars. The evidence of a widespread and almost universal familiarity with the Greek language in Palestine is overwhelming, and has rarely been seriously challenged. The existence of a popular Aramaic dialect is not less positively demonstrated. Dr. Roberts admits that this was the language of domestic life and of familiar intercourse. The more cautious of his opponents readily allow that Greek was so far intelligible to the bulk of the Palestinian Jews that they could use it for business purposes and understand it when employed in legal proceedings. The question at issue is solely whether it would be naturally used among the Jews themselves for religious purposes. Any evidence bearing on the language used by Jews in their intercourse with Greeks, Romans, or other foreigners must be at once ruled out of court. It tends to prove only what has been already conceded.

The first discourse to be considered is that of St. Peter, recorded in Acts i. 16-22. It was addressed to "the brethren," about 120 in number. There is no reason whatever to believe that any "Hellenists" were included in this number. They were undoubtedly mainly Galilæans,

but it is by no means improbable that disciples from Jerusalem were among them. Is it then conceivable that Peter would himself have used the phrase, "that field is called in their tongue Aceldama"?¹ It is not necessary to decide whether vv. 18, 19 are to be regarded as a parenthesis inserted by St. Luke. Readers of THE EXPOSITOR will not have forgotten Mr. Page's forcible arguments against this view. Whether we accept his contention or not, it is equally possible to take the words, which Peter cannot have used, inasmuch as the Aramaic was quite as much his language as theirs, as an explanatory addition incorporated by Luke. They are natural and almost necessary in the case of a Hellenist writing to a Greek like Theophilus. In denying that "Hebrew was in any form the language of Galilee," Dr. Roberts forgets that he had already described it as "the mother-tongue of the native land" of the deaf and dumb man of Decapolis, the vernacular language of his country. Unless therefore it is assumed to start with, that the language of St. Peter was Greek, there is nothing in this passage to indicate it. But what is the evidence given by the quotations? Had they been literally taken from the Septuagint, no conclusion could have been legitimately drawn as to the use of this version by Peter, unless this differed from the Hebrew on some point used in the argument. But they do not agree with the LXX. more closely than might have been expected in the case of an independent translation from the Hebrew. We have no means of knowing whether the report of this speech, be it written or, as was perhaps more probably the case, oral, used by Luke was in Aramaic or in Greek. In either case, is anything more natural to suppose than that, if there was any occasion for translation, the rendering of

¹ Dr. Roberts should not have ignored the fact that the evidence against the insertion of *iōtq* is, in the judgment of the best critics, decisive. In spite of this, he repeatedly lays much stress upon the word.

the quotation would be given in the words of the version most familiar to the translator? In the newspaper accounts of the death of the late German Emperor the texts quoted by his chaplain were, as a matter of course, given in English in the words of the Authorized Version, unless there was some material difference in the sense. So far then the current view may be regarded as unshaken. If we do not say with Meyer, "It is self-evident that Peter spoke in Aramaic," we may at least say that there is no evidence that he did not, and that without such evidence, the great probability is that he did.

Next comes the difficult incident of the "speaking with tongues." It has no direct bearing on the question before us, for whatever its nature it was clearly temporary, and in the view of the narrator, miraculous. Whether it is not possible to bring it into connexion with the unquestionably historical *glossolalia* of the Corinthian Church, by assuming that it consisted in an ecstatic utterance of religious emotion in the native dialect of the speaker, and that various nations were represented among the early believers, so that many of the strangers visiting Jerusalem were surprised to hear the tones familiar to them in their own countries, we are not then called upon to decide. Dr. Roberts finds an incidental confirmation of his theory in the fact that the devout Jews dwelling at (*κατοικοῦντες*) Jerusalem were able to express to each other what he oddly calls "their mutual wonder," and that therefore they must have had some common language in which to communicate with one another, which must have been Greek. That they were mutually intelligible is of course evident. What the language was in which they addressed each other must be decided by other considerations. But granting that it was probably Greek, this does not carry us one step beyond what is generally conceded, nor help Dr. Roberts to establish his own special thesis.

We come then to the speech of Peter. Dr. Roberts starts with assuming that "the conversion of no less than three thousand" was the result of this speech alone. But it is physically impossible that so large a number as this could have heard the words of Peter, even if we are rash enough to suppose that every one who came within the sound of his voice was at once converted by it. Besides, the text distinctly says that the converts came to "Peter and the rest of the apostles." The number of the baptized was the result of the teaching of the whole body of the Apostles—if we ought not rather to say, of the 120 disciples. If, therefore, there is any evidence that Peter spoke in Aramaic, addressing himself to the bulk of those present, to whom this would be a familiar language, there is nothing in the narrative to preclude us from supposing that other addresses were delivered in Greek to those to whom this might be unintelligible. Thus the only positive evidence is to be derived from a consideration of the quotations. These generally follow the LXX.; but for the reason already adduced, this fact is by no means decisive in favour of Dr. Roberts. He says, indeed, "there is no reason to doubt that the citations from the Old Testament were actually made as still set before us by his inspired reporter"; but this is to take a merely mechanical view of inspiration, which Dr. Roberts himself is elsewhere by no means willing to defend. St. Luke himself was certainly not present at the discourse; he must have used some one else's report, and whether the original report used by him directly or indirectly was in Greek or in Aramaic is just the question at issue. Now there is one piece of evidence, overlooked by Dr. Roberts, which points somewhat strongly in the direction of the latter language. Peter says, "God raised Him, having loosed the throes of death" (ver. 24). Many attempts have been made to show that *ωδῖνας* may here have the meaning of "bonds," but they are utterly unsuccessful. Is it not

far more probable that this strange expression is not due to Peter himself, who in all likelihood spoke of loosening the “snares” of death (חַבֵּל מִתָּה), and that his Greek reporter has substituted for this the erroneous version of the LXX., with which he would be more familiar? If so, we may agree with Meyer that this betrays the use of a Hebrew source. But if with Dr. Salmon we go so far as to say that Peter’s discourse “must, from the nature of the case, have been delivered in Greek,” what are we to say of the logic of Dr. Roberts’s deduction from this assertion? The “nature of the case,” i.e. the mixed character of the audience, made it necessary that Peter should use Greek. Therefore, says Dr. Roberts, this concession is of itself conclusive as to the point in question, “that Greek was the ordinary language of public address in Palestine,” even where the audience was not mixed! That is to say, if Lord Salisbury, addressing a meeting at Carnarvon, where there may be a large number present from various parts of the United Kingdom, uses the English language, this is conclusive proof that Welsh is not used as the ordinary language for religious and political addresses to an audience of Welshmen. It does not even prove that there are not hundreds of thousands of Welshmen who follow spoken English with difficulty, and for whom their native language is a far more usual and effective medium of address.

The discourse in iii. 12–26 bears no clear traces of the language in which it was spoken. The quotations are loosely from the LXX., and where they depart from that, they depart equally from the Hebrew. To say that “it would be mere perversity to suppose that they were uttered in any other than the Greek language,” is to regard as proved what we have seen to be by no means proved. Dr. Roberts assumes that πᾶς ὁ λαός here addressed was the same audience as that addressed at Pentecost. He ignores the fact that whereas stress was laid on the mixed charac-

ter of the former audience, nothing of the kind is indicated here.

In iv. 8-12 we have the report of a speech delivered by Peter before the ecclesiastical rulers at Jerusalem. This would be a crucial instance in favour of Dr. Roberts, if he could prove that it was delivered in Greek, for here we have a Jew addressing Jews. But he contents himself with asserting, instead of proving, "It bears every mark of having been delivered in the Greek language." But if we ask, "what single mark does it bear?" we are left unanswered. *ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν* does not come into evidence on either side; for although it is not classical Greek, it is common enough in the LXX. as a rendering of a Hebrew idiom; and the same may be said of *ἔξουθενθείς*, which is not found in this passage in the LXX., but occurs often enough elsewhere. The "unmistakeable reference to the language of the LXX." which Dr. Roberts discovers, is found only in the words *κεφαλὴ γωνίας*, and it is hard to see what other rendering of the Hebrew would have been more natural.

In the same chapter the prayer of the disciples contains a literal quotation from the LXX., but the interpretation of this fact depends entirely upon the view which we take of the relation of Luke to his sources. If we assume that the "inspired reporter" was incapable of reproducing a passage from a Hebrew psalm in the form most familiar to himself, this is strong evidence that Greek was used in devotional gatherings. But the assumption is one which seems fatal to all sober criticism.

We now come to an important term, the current interpretation of which strikes at the very basis of Dr. Roberts's contention. It is therefore essential for his purpose that he should succeed in disproving it. The Christian Church at Jerusalem appears in vi. 1 as divided into two classes, the *Ἐλληνισταί* and the *Ἑβραῖοι*. To what distinction does this division point? Tradition and critical authority

are clear enough in their verdict. The *'Ελληνισται'* are the Jews who spoke Greek as their native language; the *'Εβραιοι* are those who, as natives of Palestine, spoke Aramaic as their native tongue. This definition is implied in the Peschito version of ix. 29, and it is supported by a catena of authorities, from Chrysostom downwards, of overwhelming weight. It must be carefully noticed, however, that it does not imply that the *'Εβραιοι* had *no* knowledge of Greek; this assumption would involve us in very serious difficulties: but it does assert that there was a broad distinction in language (as, doubtless, in other respects also) between the two classes. Now this is an assertion which Dr. Roberts is imperatively required by his theory to refute. His contention is that the *'Ελληνισται* were marked by their acceptance of Greek culture and usages, the *'Εβραιοι* by their adherence to the strictest Judaism; that this distinction existed before and outside of the Christian Church, and continued to remain within it; and that the Hellenists were a small minority in the Church at Jerusalem. He would further identify the *'Εβραιοι* with "them of the circumcision who believed" of x. 45 and xi. 2; and similarly with the Judaising party in the Churches of Corinth, Philippi, etc. He has no difficulty in showing that *'Ελληνιζω* *might*, on the analogy of similar formations, mean "to favour Greek usages"; but there is no attempt to show that the word has this force, as against the weighty authority of Lobeck, who limits it to language. But let us observe what follows from Dr. Roberts's identification of "those of the circumcision" with the "Hebrews." We are compelled to suppose that even before the foundation of the Christian Church there was a body among the Jews, so considerable as to constitute one of two parties into which the nation might be—unequally, it is true, but without evident absurdity—divided, who made light of the distinctive rite of their religion; and that this division was

prominent in the earliest days of the Church. But where is there evidence of any such party before the conversion of St. Paul, and the interview of Peter with Cornelius? Dr. Roberts's assertion, "it is certain that almost from the beginning there was a liberal party in the Church, who did not imagine that the peculiar forms of Judaism were to be preserved under the gospel," needs much more support than he finds for it in the accusation brought by the false witnesses against Stephen, even though Baur and Zeller here take much the same view. Dr. Roberts is further compelled by his theory to assume that the Hellenists were a very small section of the Church, that the seven deacons, whom he takes to have been all Hellenists (a view very doubtful in itself), attended only to the wants of the poor "in that party with which they were themselves connected," and that the needs of the great majority of the poor Christians were "doubtless" seen to by "the officials of the Hebrew party," who still continued to exercise their functions. On this it is enough to remark that there is not a hint in the text of any pre-existing system of relief for the poor, other than that directed by the Apostles, nor of the limitation of the functions of the deacons now appointed to the Hellenists; and further that it would have been a very strange way of maintaining the unity of the Church to establish a distinct set of officials to give charitable relief to one small section of the believers, differing from the rest, according to Dr. Roberts's contention, not in language or in origin, but in the breadth of their religious views. We may observe too that the seven were elected by the *πλήθος τῶν μαθητῶν*, surely an unnatural course, if they were to be so limited. Indeed it is far from certain that all the seven were in any sense Hellenists.

But again with Dr. Roberts's interpretation, what are we to make of the 'Ελληνισται' of ix. 29? It is not explicitly asserted, but it is most natural to suppose that St. Paul's

discussions were carried on, like those of Stephen, in the synagogues of the Hellenists. We can understand why St. Paul, trained in all Greek learning, should have preferred to discuss with those whom he was specially fitted to meet; but why there should be synagogues of the "liberal party among the Jews," or why Paul should have addressed himself solely to these, we are unable to imagine.¹ The distinction then between Hebrews and Hellenists remains a formidable difficulty in the way of Dr. Roberts's theory, and one which he has by no means removed.

With regard to the speech of Stephen, we need find no difficulty in admitting that it was almost certainly delivered in Greek. It would be by no means inconsistent with the mediating theory which this paper is defending, that Stephen should have been unable to use any other language with facility, and that the Sanhedrin should have readily followed it. But the former supposition at once does away with what Dr. Roberts calls the decisive nature of the case. If Stephen, a Greek by name, and very probably brought up in a Greek city, could use no language but Greek, this surely does not prove that Greek was the regular language of public intercourse in Palestine.

A similar remark applies to the two speeches of St. Peter (chap. xi.) and St. James (chap. xv.) before the Church at Jerusalem. In both cases there were special reasons why Greek was the more appropriate language. On the other hand it is hard to see why any one *εἰ μὴ θέσιν φυλαττόμενος* should contend that a letter from a Roman soldier to his official superior was written in Greek rather than in Latin. In the case of the Jerusalem Council, Dr. Roberts has himself given the reason why Greek must have been used. "It would

¹ There seems to be very little in favour of Archdeacon Farrar's view (*St. Paul*, i. 126 note), that these Hellenists were *Judaic* Greek-speaking Christians (Halachists). St. Paul would surely be more likely to "dispute" with Jews than with Christians.

have been truly strange if the deputies [from Antioch] on coming up to Jerusalem . . . had found themselves precluded, by the use of Hebrew in the assembly, from understanding one word of what was said.” But the greater the stress which we lay upon the special cause for the use of Greek on this occasion, the less weight can we attach to it as evidence of the ordinary practice. It proves the possibility, which few now care to deny; it leaves untouched the probability in other quite dissimilar cases, which is just the point at issue.

Nothing now arises until the twentieth chapter, where Dr. Roberts maintains, with some plausibility, that the Jews from Asia must have used Greek in raising an outcry against St. Paul, and that this must have been understood by the ὄχλος of Jerusalem. This may be readily admitted as probable, though not demonstrated, for it is rash to deny altogether any knowledge of Aramaic even to Jews from the province of Asia. But he seems to strain a point in dealing with the demand of the chief captain to know the reason of the uproar: “Some cried one thing, some another, among the multitude,” therefore they must have understood his demand, and have been able to answer it. In this “we again find evidence of the thorough acquaintance with Greek which was then possessed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem.” Does this show more than that in a mixed multitude there were many who could to some extent use the language?

The question of Lysias to St. Paul, “Canst thou speak Greek?” raises difficulties, not removed by Dr. Roberts’s somewhat forced hypotheses, but only indirectly bearing upon our question. We may notice, however, that on Dr. Roberts’s own showing it was quite natural for a man, whether originally from Jerusalem (as he thinks) or not, to be supposed to know no language but Aramaic. If a knowledge of Greek was absolutely universal, Lysias would

not have assumed, even hastily, that the man before him knew nothing of it.

And now what conclusion are we to draw from the fact that St. Paul addressed the people in Aramaic? Unquestionably we may assume that it was an agreeable surprise to them, and that they expected to be addressed in Greek; otherwise the words "they kept the more silence" would be meaningless. But then, was this expectation due to their knowledge of the usual practice, or to the conceptions which they had formed of the character and position of the speaker? The second alternative is ignored by Dr. Roberts, but it is surely well worth consideration. What did the populace of Jerusalem know of St. Paul? We may certainly say that he was an utter stranger to almost all of them; very few, even of the Christians of Jerusalem, can have known him by sight. The Jews knew nothing more than this—that he was a man whom their fellow countrymen from Asia accused of teaching all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and the temple, and that he had polluted the holy place by bringing into it Greeks. Whatever might have been the custom with others, how could they have expected him to address them in their native language? Just in proportion therefore to their previous suspicion of his Hellenistic character was their gratification at hearing the accents of their national tongue, and the wise tact of St. Paul in employing it. No deduction appears to be legitimate except that a Jew who had long lived abroad might have been expected to speak in Greek rather than in Aramaic, and that he would have been understood, though possibly with little pleasure and not without difficulty. But another point may be put forward as worth consideration. Dr. Roberts insists more than once upon the entire absence of evidence that Aramaic was ever used by the Jewish colonies living outside Palestine. Now at least twenty,

possibly five-and-twenty years had passed since Paul had made any stay in Jerusalem. Let us suppose the case of an Englishman who has been away from all English-speaking society, with the exception of a very few days, for twenty years. He has had no English literature, not even an English Bible. He has been using during all this time a foreign language. Can we imagine him, immediately after his return, addressing in English with fluency and force a tumultuous public meeting? Yet this is what we must suppose in the case of St. Paul if we accept Dr. Roberts's views as to the entire disuse of Aramaic among the non-Palestinian Jews.

It is unfortunate for the purpose of this inquiry that the speech of St. Paul contains no quotation from the Old Testament. It would have been of extreme interest to see whether Luke, in reporting passages cited in an Aramaic speech, assimilated them, as we have seen is quite conceivable, to the LXX. version.

The speech in chap. xxiii. was delivered in the presence of Lysias. Dr. Roberts is therefore evidently right in assuming it to have been made in Greek, and as being additional evidence, if any were needed, that this language could be understood by the Sanhedrin. Further than this it does not take us.

Whether Tertullus pleaded before Felix in Latin or in Greek is a question which has no bearing on the language used by Jews in their intercourse among themselves: that St. Paul's speeches to Felix and to Festus were in Greek may be assumed as a matter of course. But it may be of some significance that the words from the Old Testament employed by our Lord in addressing Paul in the Hebrew tongue exactly agree with the LXX. version.

The remaining speeches in the Acts were delivered under circumstances which made the employment of Greek inevitable.

It may now be left to the judgment of the reader whether the evidence of this book is, as Dr. Roberts contends, absolutely decisive on the question at issue. Let it be repeated that this question is not whether Greek was very commonly understood, and used in intercourse with foreigners. It is whether it was the fitting language of popular address, and therefore that *usually* employed by Christ in His recorded discourses, as well as by His Apostles. I have of necessity only examined a small portion of the series of arguments on which Dr. Roberts bases his conclusions; but it is a portion which he regards as absolutely decisive. I venture to submit that it falls very far short of this; and that if his thesis cannot be otherwise established, it certainly will not be proved from the Acts of the Apostles.

A. S. WILKINS.

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

THE object of the following notes is to submit to the consideration of Biblical students certain facts, which, so far as I know, have not hitherto received much attention. I have endeavoured to avoid all those extraneous questions which so often mar and perplex exegesis, and I have written as briefly and simply as I could, because the subject is so interesting that I should regret if I had given any rhetorical “colour” to my arguments.

The Lord's Prayer is given in two places of Scripture, Matthew vi. 9-13 and Luke xi. 2-5, the version of Matthew being much fuller than that which the correct text of Luke presents. Apart from minor variations, the latter commences with the single word “Father,” instead of “Our

Father which art in heaven," and omits entirely the words "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth," and "but deliver us from evil."

It is common to explain the variations by ranking the Lord's prayer among utterances of our Lord which were *bis repetita*. Apart, however, from the general objections which may be raised against this theory, there are special difficulties in the application of it to the present case.

Firstly, such an explanation ignores the fact that Luke obviously considers that he is recording the original delivery of the Prayer. What writer—above all a writer who lays special claim to accuracy of arrangement—being aware that this great exemplar of prayer had already been delivered on another occasion and in a fuller form, could relate the history of its second delivery without giving any hint that it had been delivered before? What writer would without comment and without surprise describe the disciples as asking to be taught how to pray, when he knew that they had already been so taught?

Secondly, assuming the previous delivery of the Prayer to be historically certain, and that Luke is either ignorant of or ignores it, is it possible that, after a form of prayer had already been enjoined by Jesus with strong personal emphasis (*οὗτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς*, Matt. vi. 9), the disciples should have specially asked to be taught a form of prayer, or that Jesus should have replied, without remarking on their forgetfulness, by simply repeating a portion of His former words?

Thirdly, it will be observed that the "repetition" theory, even if admitted, only explains the *fact* of the existence of two varying versions, and does not attempt to give any *reason* for the variation between them. We are merely left face to face with a great and striking divergency entirely unexplained and apparently causeless. It is of course impossible to write entirely without prejudice, where so

many associations cluster around each word, but it certainly does seem that the version of Luke is, compared with that of Matthew, a maimed and mutilated version. Such a view, however, supposing that the two versions were actually delivered on two separate occasions by Jesus Himself in the present form, seems hardly compatible with reverence, and we find ourselves in the strange position of possessing two forms of prayer so like and yet so unlike that they provoke comparison, and yet each of such high authority that all comparison seems presumptuous.

These difficulties have induced the great majority of critics, including such temperate and weighty writers as Weiss (in the seventh edition of Meyer's *Kommentar*) and Oosterzee (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*), to discard the theory of repetition as untenable. They recognise, as all criticism must, that there is a human element in the composition of the Gospels, that the writers exercised to some extent their own judgment in the selection and arrangement of their materials, and that, even in relating the same event or discourse, the natural imperfection or variation of the tradition with which they were acquainted may reasonably account for variations in their narrative.

In this way a single prayer delivered by Jesus to His disciples may be related by two historians in two different shapes and as delivered under different circumstances; and criticism in the exercise of its legitimate functions may, or rather must, endeavour to discriminate between the two writers and determine which of the two more closely reproduces the absolute historical fact.

Now in the case before us there is an almost unanimous *consensus* of opinion that the position of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew is due to Matthew's desire to group these words of Jesus with other sayings to which they are akin, whereas Luke leaves them enshrined in their genuine historical setting. That being so, this question naturally presents

itself: if Luke is more accurate in relating the historical circumstances under which the Lord's Prayer was delivered, then is it not probable that the words of the Prayer, as given by him, are also more accurate and historically true? Though such a supposition would undoubtedly be received by most persons with regret, yet certainly there is *à priori* considerable probability in favour of it. It is my object, however, looking at the question as far as possible without prejudice and in a purely critical spirit, to refer to certain facts which point to an opposite conclusion.

In Matthew we have *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον*; whereas in Luke, the last three words are replaced by *δίδους ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*. Now there are three very curious points about these few words. The first is that the word *ἐπιούσιος* occurs here and here only in literature, and this fact seems to preclude the supposition (on other grounds most improbable) that the variation of the two writers is due to natural variation in translating from a common Aramaic original, for it seems almost impossible that two independent translators should have hit upon the same exceedingly curious word. It remains therefore to assume that the tradition—whether written or oral—which the writers employed was, as regards these particular words, expressed in Greek. That being so, the second point becomes important. The phrase *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* occurs only three times in the New Testament, namely here and Luke xix. 47, Acts xvii. 11; so that it is certainly Luke's own (*richt Lukanisch*, Weiss), and therefore the *σήμερον* of Matthew is much more likely to be original. Thirdly, if this is so, then *δίδους* is clearly an alteration of Luke's: instead of "to-day" he writes "daily," and having done so he is compelled to substitute for the aorist *δός* the present *δίδους*. Moreover *δίδους* bears in itself the sign of being an alteration, for the use of a present in this petition is inconsistent with the use of an aorist in *all* the others.

Again, where Matthew has ἄφεις ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα, Luke writes ἄφεις ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας. Now Winer (*Grammatik*, sixth edition, pp. 31, 32) describes ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι as a phrase simply translated from Hebrew, and as one of those expressions which would “either convey no meaning or a wrong meaning to a born Greek”; and in fact as a Greek expression it means “to remit debts,” it is only as a Hebraism that it can mean “to forgive sins.” Here, therefore, we seem to have in Luke purer Greek, in Matthew a more accurate reproduction of the original. Moreover the sense makes it clear that Luke’s version is the less accurate, for in Matthew the meaning of ὀφειλήματα in the first half of the petition, being fixed and known, determines and defines the meaning of ὀφειλέταις in the second half; that is, since ὀφειλήματα must be used metaphorically, ὀφειλέταις is marked as used metaphorically also (“trespasses . . . them that trespass”). Matthew’s version is perfectly clear, and the two clauses of the petition are in perfect balance: Luke, on the other hand, by altering ὀφειλήματα to ἀμαρτίας, leaves the meaning of πάντι ὀφειλοντι at any rate uncertain (“sins . . . every one that is indebted,” A.V.). Lastly, the aorist ἀφήκαμεν of Matthew, though more beautiful when thoughtfully considered than the present ἀφίομεν of Luke, is on the other hand certainly less obvious, and therefore on the well-known principle of preferring the more difficult is more likely to be original.

So far I have only alluded to purely critical grounds, and though to some these may appear slight, yet to me it seems that, considering the brevity and simplicity of the words compared, there would have been *a priori* an improbability of their yielding any evidence at all, and that the evidence which they actually yield may fairly be regarded as strong and indeed remarkable. The presumption which it affords in favour of Matthew’s version may however be supported by reference to certain points, which are not purely critical

but rather involve questions of taste and feeling, and which therefore, though unfitted to be the foundation of a critical argument, may fitly be used to reinforce such an argument when already partially established.

The words *δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον* are even more beautiful than *δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*, for they exhibit a deeper trustfulness and are more in accordance with that essentially Christian teaching which bids us “take no thought for the morrow.”

The aorist *ἀφήκαμεν* when compared with the present *ἀφίομεν* is singularly forcible; it involves the supposition that, before we venture to approach God in prayer for forgiveness, we have *already* forgiven; there is a grave warning in the word (cf. Matt. v. 24, “*first* be reconciled,” etc.).

Further, the connection of the two clauses in Matthew (*ἄφεσ, . . . ως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν*) seems clearer than that in Luke (*ἄφεσ, . . . καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν*). Matthew makes us ask for forgiveness only *in as far as* we have already forgiven, and *on condition that* we have forgiven; we do not rest the appeal on any act of ours, but we say that without certain preceding acts—and whether they have been done we leave God to judge—we have no claim to appeal at all; on the other hand the second clause in Luke is not only assertive in character—we assert that we forgive others—but the words in which the assertion is introduced (*καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ*) certainly seem to suggest a claim to receive forgiveness, as it were, “of congruity.” I do not of course maintain that Luke's words are intended to bear this meaning, but that, being capable of bearing it, they are inherently inferior to those of Matthew. The emphasis of *πάντι ὄφειλοντι* as compared with *τοῖς ὄφειλέταις* also deserves notice.

Passing on to the final petition, Luke exhibits a degree of incompleteness. When we use such forms of petition

as "Remember not, Lord, our offences," or "Be not angry with us for ever," we distinctly contemplate the opposite possibility, namely, that God may "remember our offences," or "may be angry with us for ever." So when left by themselves, as in Luke, the words, "Lead us not into temptation," do distinctly suggest the idea that God may "lead into temptation"; and though, no doubt, explanations may be given which modify the hardness of such an expression, yet the best of them do not fully remove it. Directly, however, that the words "but deliver us from evil" are added, as in Matthew, then all becomes different. The sentence then becomes one of those sentences containing two antithetical or contrasted clauses, in which the emphasis is really on the second clause, and the first clause though co-ordinate in construction is really subordinate in thought, serving to bring out more clearly by contrast the force of the second, so that if separated from its connection and taken by itself the first clause may convey a false impression, as Luke's words may do here. As the point is of importance in Biblical criticism, I will refer to two instances which occur close together in Luke x. 20, 21. In the first the Seventy had just returned, and inform Jesus "with joy" that "even the devils are made subject" to them; Jesus replies by promising them confirmation of this power, and adds, *πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὄνόματα ὑμῶν ἐνγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.* Here the Textus Receptus reads *χαίρετε δὲ μᾶλλον*, and, though no doubt *μᾶλλον* is an explanatory gloss, still the explanation which it affords is a correct one; and certainly, if the words *μὴ χαίρετε . . . ὑποτάσσεται* are taken apart from their connection as an absolutely independent command, they convey a very different impression from that which they convey where they stand. In the second case the point is perhaps more delicate, the antithesis not being formally expressed as an

antithesis though it is none the less a real one. Rejoicing in the success of the Seventy, Jesus says, Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, Πάτερ, . . . ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις. Here the two clauses are joined by *καὶ*, but the opposition between them is marked in the contrast of “the wise and understanding” with “babes,” and still more marked in the highly antithetical assonance of ἀπέκρυψας and ἀπεκάλυψας. In this case I think that no one will say that taken by itself the first clause—“I thank Thee that Thou didst hide these things from the wise”—when taken alone yields even tolerable sense.

Lastly, considering the eager expectation of the second Advent which characterized the period, the supposition that the petition “Thy will be done, as in heaven also upon earth,” is not original but *inserted* by Matthew after the petition “Thy kingdom come,” is much less probable than the supposition that the words are original and *omitted* by Luke.

THOMAS ETHELBERT PAGE.

THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

LUKE xxii. 19; 1 COR. xi. 24.

BISHOP ELLICOTT, in his valuable commentary on 1 Corinthians, has this note on $\tauοῦτο ποιεῖτε$, xi. 24: “To render the words ‘sacrifice this,’ in accordance with a Hebraistic use of $\piοιεῖν$ in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39, Lev. ix. 7, al.; see Schleusn. *Lex. Vet. Test. s.v.*), is to violate the regular use of $\piοιεῖν$ in the N.T., and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them.” His own explanation of “do this” is—“continually thus take bread, give thanks, and break it.”

In reviewing Bishop Ellicott’s commentary in the *Classical Review* for April, the present writer made this remark on the note in question:

“In short, to quote this text in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is only in degree less unwise than to quote the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Supposing that St. Paul and St. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than $\piοιεῖν$? ”

A writer in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review* (No. 51, pp. 252, 253) makes the following criticisms upon the remark just quoted. “1. The passage in St. John’s First Epistle, v. 8, seems to us to differ less in ‘degree’ than in kind from 1 Cor. xi. 24, where there is no question of the reading of different manuscripts. 2. Why does Dr. Plummer elect to ignore what might be almost called the *contemporanea expositio* furnished by the two passages in Justin Martyr, as well as the evidence of the Early Liturgies? 3. If St. Paul and St. Luke did

intend a sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than *ποιεῖν*? ”

The three points here raised will make a convenient division of the subject. Of the value of the first and last as criticism, readers of the EXPOSITOR must judge.

1. No one would think of intimating that 1 John v. 7 (not 8) is similar in any way to 1 Cor. xi. 24. But it is quite possible to make an *equally unwise use* of two totally different texts. And if the view of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, which has been almost universal until the present generation, be correct, then to make use of the passage in order to support the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, is not a wise proceeding; any more than it is wise to use 1 John v. 7 to support the doctrine of the Trinity. In the one case a highly disputable *text* is employed to prove an important doctrine: in the other a highly disputable *interpretation* is employed for a similar purpose. The latter proceeding is “in degree less unwise” than the former, because the doctrine is less momentous, and because the interpretation employed, however improbable, is just possible, whereas the genuineness of the disputed portion of 1 John v. 7, 8 is not possible. But there is abundance of unwisdom in both cases, for the person who thus argues lays himself open to the obvious remark: “The doctrine which you advocate must indeed be questionable, when you are driven to make use of such very questionable material in order to prove it.” Moreover, to make use of such material, without at the same time confessing that it *is* much questioned, is to provoke a suspicion of either great ignorance or bad faith. “Either you did not know that your argument is based on questionable material; in which case you are not qualified to discuss the matter: or, although you did know this, you wished to take advantage of the ignorance of others.” In most cases this suspicion would be very untrue, but it would not be unreasonable: and those who are interested in

maintaining the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion would do wisely in ceasing to lay any stress upon an argument which cannot be fairly used without admissions which deprive it of almost all appreciable value. Yet a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1886 (p. 328), is rash enough to stake everything upon this highly disputable interpretation of "Do this." "We do not see that any other explanation of the origin of the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is forthcoming." A Zwinglian would be much gratified by so enormous a concession.

2. But, it is asserted, what might be almost called the contemporaneous exposition of Justin Martyr and the evidence of the early liturgies support the sacrificial interpretation.

Let us admit for the moment that Justin and some of the early liturgies interpret *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* "Offer this." Is such evidence of much weight in face of the evidence on the other side. And here I am quite content to adopt the language of a recent writer, who certainly has no prejudices against the sacrificial rendering of the words, but evidently would gladly accept it, if he could think it tenable. Canon Mason, in *The Faith of the Gospel* (Rivingtons, 1888, p. 309) says: "But the rendering 'Offer this' has against it the fact that it is of recent origin. *All the Greek Fathers*, with the exception of S. Justin Martyr, treat the words as meaning, 'Perform this action.'" These Greek Fathers knew their own language, knew their Greek Testament, knew their Septuagint; and many of them held very high views indeed respecting the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Is it likely that all of them would pass over so conclusive an argument for the Eucharistic Sacrifice as that the very words used by Christ Himself in instituting it, necessarily, or at least probably, mean "Sacrifice this" or "Offer this sacrifice"? If St. Paul and St. Luke and their contemporaries had understood the words in this sense, is it probable that a tradition of such moment, connected with the central rite of

the Christian religion, would have left no impression on any one of the Greek Fathers, excepting (if he be an exception) Justin Martyr? The only reasonable explanation of their invariably treating the words as meaning "Perform this action," is that they had never heard of the other rendering, and that it never occurred to them that such a rendering was even possible. It is improbable that they knew of the sacrificial interpretation and passed it over in silence; but if any one cares to adopt this hypothesis, then their general rejection of the sacrificial interpretation is certainly a weighty piece of evidence against this interpretation.

But does Justin Martyr really differ from the other Greek Fathers on this point? The fact that none of the others even notice the sacrificial rendering, at once creates a presumption that his words do not imply that he adopted it. Some of them had read Justin. If those who had read him had understood him to advocate so striking a rendering as "Offer this sacrifice in remembrance of Me," would not some of them have called attention to the fact? But let us look at Justin himself, and form our own conclusions as to his meaning.

ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὐ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν (*Trypho*, xli.).

Mr. Sadler, in contending for the rendering "Offer this," translates Justin thus:

"The offering of the flour commanded to be offered (*προσφέρεσθαι*) for persons cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the offering of the bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ gave command to offer (do, *ποιεῖν*) for a memorial (*ἀνάμνησιν*) of the sufferings which He underwent for those whose souls are cleansed from all iniquity" (*Comm. on St. Luke*, p. 561).

It will be observed that the words “of the offering” between “a type” and “of the bread” are an insertion made by the translator. Justin does not say “was a type of the offering of the bread,” but “was a type of the bread.” It would have been quite easy for him to have written *τύπος ἦν τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας*, but he has not done so; possibly because the idea of “offering of the bread” was not in his mind. Secondly, it is by no means certain that Justin uses *ποιεῖν* in the sense of “offer.” The words *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* are an intentional quotation of the words of institution, and they naturally draw after them the verb with which they are there joined, viz. *ποιεῖν*. The same may be said of the similar passage in chap. lxx. of the same Dialogue.¹ Thirdly, it does not at all follow, that, if Justin himself used *ποιεῖν* in the sense of “offer,” therefore he believed that St. Paul and St. Luke understood the word in this sense. The question before us is, not whether Justin considered the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, nor yet whether *he* uses *ποιεῖν* for “to offer,” but whether his language is such as to show that he believed *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* in the words of institution to mean “Offer this sacrifice.” The first question must be answered in the affirmative, and very possibly the second also; but the third must be answered in the negative. A sober and cautious inquirer will require something much more definite than these two passages to convince him that, in the interpretation of a crucial text such as this, Justin differs from all the other Greek Fathers, and that this difference is *never once alluded to by any of them*. And even if it were proved that Justin did understand *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* as meaning “Sacrifice this,” is his authority such to outweigh that of all the other Greek Fathers put together?

¹ The number of idiomatic uses of the verb “to do” in English should put us on our guard as to dogmatizing respecting the meaning of such a phrase as “to do the bread” in Greek.

Canon Mason takes no notice of the alleged evidence of the early liturgies: and he is quite right in doing so, for the argument is trivial. That the early liturgies bear witness to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is indisputable; and that they quote the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* is equally indisputable: but that the sacrificial terms used are intended as equivalents of *ποιεῖτε*, there is no evidence. Whence, then, comes the notion of sacrifice? From *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. This solemn act is to be continually performed in remembrance of Christ, *i.e.* to "show forth His *death*"; which death was a sacrifice. This is the meaning of the "therefore," which occurs in the liturgies between the words of institution and "we offer," and which is closely joined with "mindful" and far removed from "we offer." Thus in the Clementine Liturgy;—*Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν . . . προσφέρομέν σοι, κ.τ.λ.*;—some forty words intervening in the place left vacant. Similarly in the Roman Liturgy;—*Unde et memores . . . offerimus*: where thirty words separate the *unde* from *offerimus*. In the Greek Liturgy of St. James six lines of close print intervene between *Μεμνημένοι οὖν* and *προσφέρομέν σοι*. The Syriac Liturgy of St. James is still more conclusive; for there "Therefore we celebrate the memorial of Thy death" is in one sentence, and "We offer to Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice" is in another, which is quite cut off from the "therefore." Any person who will take the trouble to look at these instances (Hammond's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, pp. 17, 336, 41, 70) will easily see that the "therefore" refers back, not to "*do this*" in the sense of "*offer this sacrifice*," but to "*do this in remembrance of Me*." "Because Christ said 'Commemorate My death by performing this action,' *therefore* we remember His passion, death, and resurrection, and offer this bread and this cup." To quote the early liturgies in support of the doctrine that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, is thoroughly

legitimate; to quote them in favour of the sacrificial translation of $\tauοῦτο ποιεῖτε$, is very much the reverse.

Against the proposed translation may be urged (1) the ordinary meaning of $\piοιεῖν$, both in Greek literature generally, and in the N.T.; (2) the interpretation of all the Greek Fathers with the possible (though not probable) exception of Justin Martyr; (3) the fact that the ordinary meaning of $\piοιεῖν$ makes excellent sense and suits the contexts; (4) the authority of the early liturgies, which do *not* use $\piοιεῖν$ or *facere* when the bread and wine are offered, but $\piροσφέρειν$ or *offerre*, although the words of institution immediately precede the oblation and suggest $\piοιεῖν$ or *facere*; (5) the authority of the large majority of modern commentators of the most various schools: Cornelius à Lapide, Faber Stapulensis, Maldonatus, Isaac Williams, Alford, Plumptre, Farrar, F. C. Cook, T. S. Evans, T. Shore, Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, Lias, Olshausen, Holtzmann, Lange, and De Wette (on 1 Corinthians), take no notice of the words, as if there could be no question as to their signification; while Estius, Quesnel, Bengel, Blomfield, Peile, Wordsworth, Stanley, Harvey Goodwin, Beet, Elliott, Godet, Lange, Meyer, Kaye, Webster and Wilkinson, Mason, and De Wette (on Luke), either expressly reject the sacrificial interpretation, or give the ordinary rendering without mentioning any other as worth considering; (6) the fact that St. Paul and St. Luke might easily have placed the sacrificial meaning beyond a doubt by using a word which could mean nothing else. But this leads directly to the last division of our subject.

3. It has been asked, “Supposing that St. Paul and St. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than $\piοιεῖν$? ” This question has been evaded rather than answered by a second, “If St. Paul and St. Luke *did* intend a sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to

use than *ποιεῖν*?" A straightforward answer to this second question can very easily be made: They would certainly have used either *προσφέρειν* or *ἀναφέρειν*, not to mention other words which mean "to sacrifice" or "to offer," but are not so suitable or obvious as these two. In the Epistle to the Hebrews *προσφέρειν* occurs about twenty times in the active and passive voice, always in this sense. It occurs several times in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts in this sense, as well as in some other places in the N.T. The cognate substantive *προσφορά*, "an offering," occurs in the Acts, in Romans, Ephesians, and Hebrews. The use of *προσφέρειν* in John xvi. 2 is instructive, as showing how clearly the Evangelists and Apostles could express a sacrificial idea when they wished to do so. "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," or, as the Revisers more accurately render it, "will think that he offereth service unto God." St. John, if he had not intended any sacrificial meaning, might easily have said *ἀρέσκειν*, or *τιμᾶν*, or *δουλεύειν*, or *δοξάζειν*, and the like. What he does say is *λατρείαν προσφέρειν*, the substantive meaning "*religious service*," and the verb "to offer *sacrifice*." *Ἀναφέρειν* occurs in the sense of offering sacrifice in Hebrews, James, and 1 Peter. Why does neither St. Paul nor St. Luke employ either of these obvious words? Because they did not wish to express what these words naturally express.

The conclusion at which we have arrived seems to be this: that there is not very much to be said for the proposal to translate *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* "offer this sacrifice," and much to be said against it. As Canon Mason rightly urges, its recent origin is fatal to it; and that serious objection (as we have seen) does not stand alone. Wetzer and Welte, the Roman Catholic editors of the *Kirchenlexicon*, act wisely in not urging this translation in support of sacrificial doctrine (Art. *Abendmahl*), and in this they seem to be

following the example of the Council of Trent. Those who have at heart a more general belief in the Eucharist as a sacrifice will do well in placing this argument for the doctrine very much in the back ground ; and they will do still better in abandoning it altogether.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

THE LATEST DISCOVERIES AMONG THE
FAYUM MANUSCRIPTS.

IT is now exactly three years since I first brought under the notice of the readers of THE EXPOSITOR a general account of the marvellous "find" from Egypt called the Fayum Manuscripts. In May, 1885, I gave a sketch of the subject as then known ; but three years have since elapsed, and much is now known which then lay concealed from the diligent and learned eyes of the Viennese scholars who have been devoting the labour of their lives to the elucidation of a discovery hitherto unparalleled. It will be my object in this paper to bring the information about these later investigations down to date, hoping thereby to stir up some persons to assist in the work by subscribing at least for the somewhat expensive but yet most valuable *Mittheilungen*, which from time to time gathers into permanent shape the results gained. Its full title we give below.¹

The chief interest in the discovery for Biblical scholars centred in what has usually been called the Fayum Gospel fragment. I described that manuscript in the number of this Review published in August, 1885. Three years, however, comprise such a long space, and so many events happen in them, that the most important discoveries are soon forgotten. It will perhaps then be the best course to

¹ *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erherzog Rainer.*

recall the facts at that time known, before proceeding to state the results gained by subsequent investigations. Dr. Bickell, a Roman Catholic divine and Professor of Christian Archæology in the University of Innsbruck, published in that year (1885) a fragment of a Gospel, which he maintained to be a genuine relic or specimen of those original documents which St. Luke tells us he used in the compilation of his own Gospel. As I shall have to refer to the text of this gospel fragment hereafter, I give it below, as I cannot certainly calculate upon every reader having my article at hand for the purpose of consultation.¹ The translation of Bickell's text which I then gave ran as follows : “ Now after eating, as they marched out ; You shall all be offended this night according to the Scripture, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. Peter said, Though all, yet not I. He said to him, The cock will crow (not the usual word, but a word we might translate ‘ cry cuckoo ’) twice, and thou shalt previously deny Me thrice.”

This discovery of Bickell's caused a great sensation. The *Times* took the matter up, and its columns gave a much wider circulation to the subject than any Review could. Theological professors and Biblical critics contributed their quota ; but notwithstanding all objections, Bickell still holds to his view that here we have a genuine third-century fragment of one of the earliest evangelical documents, and in this contention he is supported by scholars who are the best entitled to speak on this question, such as Wessely, Karabacek, and Krall, who have given years to the study of these Fayûm manuscripts, and must therefore possess a special skill in their decipherment to which no outsider can lay any claim. Bickell now admits that he was mistaken

¹ Μητὰ δὲ τὸ φαγεῖν ὡς ἐξῆγον· πάντες ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νικτὶ σκανδαλισθήσεσθε κατὰ τὸ γραφέν· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται. Εἰπόντος τοῦ Πέτρου· καὶ εἰ πάντες οὐκ ἔγω· ἐφη αὐτῷ· ὁ ἀλεκτρυών δις κοκκυξει καὶ σὺ πρῶτον τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

on one point. The fifth and sixth words in the Greek text given above were $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\xi\hat{\eta}\gamma\sigma\nu$. These words he proposes to change into $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\xi \epsilon\theta\sigma\nu\varsigma$, so that the English version would run thus : “Now after eating according to custom”—that is, according to the usual paschal ritual. The details of his reasons for this change, which are purely technical, would be of no interest to any but specialists in this department of palaeographical study, and must be omitted. Bickell takes occasion, however, from these words, $\epsilon\xi \epsilon\theta\sigma\nu\varsigma$, to append a discussion concerning the order and time of the consecration of the bread and wine, and the institution of the Lord’s supper as described by the synoptics and by St. Paul. St. Matthew (xxvi. 26), St. Mark (xiv. 22), and St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23) place the consecration of the bread first, after which came that of the wine. St. Luke (xxii. 17), on the other hand, mentions a cup first, of which Christ says, “Take this and divide it among yourselves,” after which he places the formal consecration of the bread, followed “after supper” by another cup, which was blessed with the words, “This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which is shed for you.” Bickell gives a full description of the different parts of the paschal feast according to the customary ritual, which seems to me to clear up part of the difficulty, as it shows that St. Luke simply gives from his sources an enlarged account of the Paschal feast. There were several cups used at the feast, which was very prolonged. The wine too was of a mild character, and always mingled largely with water. The various elements of the Paschal rite were: First came the initiatory thanksgiving and prayer, with drinking of the first cup. Then the question and answer about the origin of the feast, together with the first part of the Hallel (Pss. exiii. and exiv.). Then came the blessing and drinking of the second cup, followed by the blessing, breaking, and eating of the bread. The eating of the paschal lamb, the central rite of the whole ceremonial,

then took place. There next succeeded in due order thanksgiving after the eating, with blessing and drinking of the third cup, the second part of the Hallel or great Hallelujah (Pss. cxv.-cxviii. and cxxxvi.); and finally the blessing and drinking of the fourth cup, with thanksgiving.

The difficulty raised by Bickell is briefly this: What position in the ceremonial is to be assigned to the consecration of the bread and wine which became the great Christian sacrament? Was it the second cup, followed by the blessing and breaking of bread, which formed the germ of the Holy Communion, or was it the third or even the fourth and last cup which the Saviour selected? In this latter case, where would come the blessing of the bread, which only found its place in the ritual in connection with the second cup? But this does not complete the difficulty. St. Matthew and St. Mark seem to place the consecration of the bread and wine during the meal, "And as they did eat" (Mark), "as they were eating" (Matthew), while St. Luke and St. Paul distinctly place the consecration of the cup after supper, "Likewise also the cup after supper" (Luke), "After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped" (Paul), a view which the liturgical tradition of the Christian Church from the time of the *Apostolic Constitutions* has steadily followed.

After all it seems to me that Bickell's difficulties are not very serious, though very interesting, and the reconciliation of the evangelical narratives not so very difficult. All the narratives place the consecration of the bread during the meal. This was strictly according to the usual ritual. St. Luke and St. Paul place the consecration of the cup after the entire feast, and make it therefore the third or fourth cup. St. Matthew and St. Mark do not give any note of time as to the period when the consecration of the cup took place. They seem to connect it with the consecration of the bread. They give no hint of any interval, perhaps two

or three hours, which elapsed. They are silent, but their silence is no argument, and their silence is quite compatible with the theory that the cup was the third cup, as St. Luke and St. Paul plainly assert. The consecration of the cup in this case was separated by a wide interval from that of the bread; but this constitutes a difficulty only for Western minds trained in a sacramental ritual where the two acts are necessarily connected; to the Jewish mind the difficulty would have been non-existent. This somewhat lengthened discussion may have been somewhat tedious, but it will show what important questions may be raised by these Fayūm manuscripts, when the simple words *εξ οὐσίας* in Bickell's hands lead up to such critical questions as the method and order of the Paschal feast and the institution of the Holy Communion. Professor Bickell's own theological position may indeed somewhat affect his judgment on this question, as he has for the last ten years been trying to trace out analogies between the Jewish Passover and the Roman Mass, which he has embodied in an article in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 1880, pp. 90–112, and in his work styled *Messe und Pascha*.¹

Bickell has been fortunate enough to discover another most interesting fragment among the Fayūm documents, in a small portion of a third century liturgy. Hitherto the oldest liturgical manuscript has dated back only to the fifth century, so that a manuscript with a liturgical fragment of the third century is a treasure from every point of view, doctrinal as well as liturgical. The scarcity of manuscripts, and their comparative lateness,

¹ Dr. Edersheim, in his *Life of Jesus*, ii. p. 511, ed. 1886, refers to Bickell's theories on this question. Edersheim offers a theory of his own as to the consecration of the bread. He thinks our Lord introduced a new blessing of bread unknown previously to the paschal ritual. The words of our fragment would not then be true, "When they had eaten according to custom" (*εξ οὐσίας*). Lightfoot, on St. Matthew, cap. xxvi., Opp. t. ii. pp. 257–259, starts much the same theory.

has sometimes been used as an objection to the primitive character of liturgies. But then men forget how complete was the extirpation of Christian documents owing to the great Diocletian persecution, with which the fourth century opened. We have practically no Christian manuscripts older than the fourth century, owing to that terrible and thorough-going time of trial. The enemies of the truth clearly saw that the Christian religion was a historical creed, and they thought to destroy it by extirpating the documents on which the Christians depended so much and valued so highly. One of the most interesting and beautiful stories of the great Diocletian persecution is that of the testimony and martyrdom of St. Irene of Thessalonica. The leading charge against her was that she concealed a vast quantity of sacred books and parchments which she and her sisters were accustomed, according to her Acts, to study day and night. The anxiety of the Roman magistrate to get at these documents is manifest in the examination of her sisters, who suffered some time before St. Irene, and the magistrates' satisfaction at their final discovery is equally evident in the Acts and examination of St. Irene herself, as told in the last chapter of the Eighth Book of Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*. The very disappearance of ancient liturgical manuscripts makes the Fayûm fragment the more valuable. The Greek text we give below,¹ of which Bickell gives the following tentative translation : " He that was born in Bethlehem and reared up in Nazareth, who dwelt in Galilee, we have seen His sign from Heaven. When the star appeared the shepherds watching in the field were astonished. Falling on their knees, they said, Glory be

¹ Recto : Ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐν Βηθλέεμ καὶ ανατραφεὶς ἐν Ναζαρέτ, κατοικήσας ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαΐ, εἶδομεν σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ· (τῷ) ἀστέρος φανέντος ποιμένες ἄγραι λόντες ἰθαίμασαν· (οὐ) γονιπεσόντες ἔλεγον· δόξα τῷ Πατρί, ἀλληλούϊα· δόξα τῷ Τίῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ Ιησούτι, ἀλληλούϊα, ἀλληλούϊα, ἀλληλούϊα. Verso: Τιβί ἐ· Ἐκλεκτὸς ὁ ἄγιος Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, ὁ ληρήσας μετάνοιαν ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς ἀφεσιν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

to the Father, Alleluia, glory be to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia." And again, "Typi 5. St. John the Baptist is chosen, who has preached in all the world repentance for the remission of our sins." Bickell, and his fellow investigators at Vienna, regard these extracts as genuine third-century remains on several grounds. First come the palaeographical reasons,—the character of the writing, style of contractions, etc., of which men like Wessely and Krall are the only competent judges, from their special familiarity with these documents. Bickell offers, however, a doctrinal argument of an interesting character. He maintains that the first fragment at least must come from a pre-Arian and pre-Athanasian period, before controversy had made men suspicious of every novel phrase and narrowed Christian freedom by raising up doctrinal barriers on every side. After the time of Arius, the Catholic party would never consent to insert the Alleluia between the name of the Father and that of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; while, on the other hand, the Arian party would never have consented to the equal glory and honour assigned to the Divine persons of the Godhead. Bickell's theory as to the nature of the liturgical fragments may seem to some biassed by his own theological views. He regards them as Antiphons sung in connection with the Psalms which intervened between the reading of the Old Testament and the New Testament lesson used at the beginning of the Liturgy or service for the Holy Communion. Antiphons are short verses or passages repeating the dominant note or enforcing some special Christian lesson in connection with an Old Testament psalm. Their use in the Anglican Church has been largely discontinued. A well known passage in the Preface to the Prayer Book tells how the Reformers simplified the Church Service by cutting off "anthems, responds, invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of

the Scriptures." Some few still survive however. The Easter anthems, sung instead of the Psalm Venite Exultemus Domino at the beginning of the ordinary Morning Prayer, are antiphons, the Gloria Patri sung at the close of each psalm, according to the Anglican rite, is antiphonal in character, putting a Christian meaning and interpretation upon the ancient Hebrew melodies. In the Roman Church the only antiphon sung during the Paschal season consists in the repetition of Alleluias similar to those we find in the ancient liturgy of the Egyptian Church, while in the ordinary service of the Mass, the Introit, Offertory, and Communion are the technical names given to antiphons sung at the various stages of the service. Bickell regards these Fayûm fragments as antiphons sung, the one in praise of John the Baptist on the Eve of the Epiphany, as still is the case with the Coptic Church, while the other formed a portion of the ritual used on the Epiphany, which since the earliest times has been, in the East, the feast dedicated to the celebration of our Lord's nativity. Bickell even undertakes to determine the psalm to which the Epiphany Antiphon belonged. He fixes upon the 33rd Psalm for this purpose, and even assigns different portions of the antiphon to the different parts of the psalm. This contribution made by Dr. Bickell raises many important questions. If genuine, it pushes back the liturgical and festival system of the Church into the early third century, and therefore practically to the times of the earliest Christian Church, because the early Christians were intensely conservative. This is a view we often forget in our criticisms. We are apt to think that new rites and ceremonies could be introduced, and were introduced, at random, or at the will and pleasure of any influential bishop or presbyter. But this is absurd. In no department of life's activity are men so intensely conservative as in religion. Let me illustrate that fact, which has been too much for-

gotten in many modern controversies concerning the creed and Church government of primitive ages. Take the Anglican Church for instance. It has been three centuries and a half separated from the Roman communion. Yet rites prevail in it without any formal sanction in the Prayer Book, preserved from Roman times simply by the force of conservative tradition. The Gloria repeated before and after the Gospel, bowing and turning to the East at the creeds, and the silence of the people during the Lord's Prayer at the opening of the Holy Communion, in the face of a direct rubrical order for its audible repetition by them, are all survivals of pre-Reformation usages. In the fifth century it was just the same. St. Augustine in one of his letters to St. Jerome, tells us how an African bishop well nigh lost his whole congregation because he dared to adopt St. Jerome's rendering of Ivy instead of Gourd in the narrative of Jonah's preaching at Nineveh. The people were so indignant at the slightest change in the version they had been always accustomed to hear, that Augustine says they interrupted the reader, shouted out the ancient version, and were not contented till the Jewish inhabitants were called in to decide the true rendering, which they did, in opposition to St. Jerome, and in favour of the Old Latin Version which had come down to them sanctified by the memories of saints, doctors, and martyrs, reaching back to apostolic times. Again, when we take up the writings of Tertullian, we find that about the year 200 men pushed this conservative tendency to absurd extremes. While again the Montanist movement was simply a protest of intense conservatism in favour of ancient Church principles against the laxer views and principles current in the West. And now to apply these general considerations to the matter in hand. I can only conclude that if such matters as the festival system of the Church, and antiphons, and the ritual system, and bishops and the episcopal system existed universally

in the third century throughout the Christian Church, they must have existed from the beginning, or else their introduction would have created such a noise and commotion as would have left its mark deeply printed upon history.

I must very briefly mention some other Fayûm discoveries. Wessely has published an elaborate paper touching the dates of the Greek papyri belonging to the period of the Roman empire, showing that the imperial year in Egypt was a fixed matter, and dated from the 29th August in one year to the 28th of August in the next; so that if an emperor succeeded to the throne ever so short a period prior to the 29th of August, that time was counted his first year, while his second year began with the said 29th of August. Wessely's paper has many other illustrations of the inner life and high social organization of the Roman empire, very important for the purposes of ecclesiastical history when books like Mr. Cotter Morison's "Service of Man" are asserting, in the face of all historical evidence, that Christianity only arose when the ancient civilization of the world was dead or in its death throes. The study of these Fayûm documents will prove that never was the social organization of the empire so perfect and so complex as when Christianity had run two centuries of its chequered existence. In a note on page 22 of his article, Wessely notices the interior communications between the various parts of the empire and the capital, and specially between Rome and Alexandria. When one remembers how little men know of the methods and times of even royal communications and posts in England three centuries ago, it is very interesting to get a glimpse into the methods of the imperial posts in the times of Cyprian and Origen. A papyrus horoscope dated December 4th, 137, has also been deciphered. It is an attempt to read a man's destiny by the position of the stars on a certain day, which fact enables its exact date to be settled by astronomical calcula-

tions, while the whole document throws an interesting sidelight upon Egyptian life and religion in the times of Justin Martyr and the Antonines. The Christian organization of Egypt soon after the triumph of Christianity can be realized from these documents. Oxyrrhynchus and Arsinoe were towns where Christianity in its monastic shape obtained their greatest triumphs. They were both celebrated in the religious struggles of the fourth and fifth centuries. Oxyrrhynchus, about A.D. 400, became enthusiastically monastic, a very town of monks, as Ruffinus tells us, "filled within and without with monks, who swarmed even in the ancient temples, which they had turned into monasteries, so that there were more monasteries than houses in the town."¹ He then tells us that there were twelve churches in the town; a number afterwards enlarged to 360. Now Wessely has from a study of his documents restored the names of the streets and the dedications of the numerous parish churches of the neighbouring town of Arsinoe, affording vivid and almost contemporary illustrations of the confessors and martyrs, like Thecla, Victor, Theodore, Apollonius, who suffered in the Diocletian persecution, after whom the churches were doubtless named. Finally, Krall, to whom the Coptic documents have been entrusted, has contributed some papers of great interest. One deals with the Coptic version of the Book of Zechariah, Krall having found a parchment volume of 133 leaves containing the minor prophets in Coptic, from which he shows that various Greek versions of the Scriptures were current in Egypt; some approaching more closely to the Alexandrian, and others more to the Vatican Manuscript. Krall has also elaborated a theory that a large portion of the newly found manuscripts, including some of the most important Biblical

¹ Ruffinus, *Historia Monachorum*, cap. v. Ruffinus mentions that in Oxyrrhynchus alone, there were, according to the local bishop, 20,000 nuns and 10,000 monks.

fragments, belong to a convent library which he fixes at the ancient Hermopolis Magna, the modern Ashmuneim, built perhaps on the supposed site of our Lord's residence in this city of Hermopolis, the refuge of His infancy according to tradition, certainly as old as the third century (Hyvernat, *Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte*, pp. 82, 92). I cannot at the end of this very discursive paper give any account of Krall's elaborate essays, which will well repay careful study, stuffed full as they are of vivid illustrations of ancient Christian life and literature. Mr. Butler, in the preface to his work on the ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt, has remarked that "the history of Christian Egypt is still unwritten, or at least that part of it about which the most romantic interest gathers, the period which witnessed the passing away of the ancient cults and the change of the pagan world. We have yet to learn how the cold worship, the tranquil life and the mummified customs of that immemorial people dissolved in the fervour of the new faith; how faces like those sculptured on the monuments of the Pharaohs became the faces of anchorites, saints, and martyrs." Butler's statement is true, but modern research is speedily accumulating materials for the supply of that want he so keenly laments. Christian Egypt is now revealing herself, her people, her sacred literature, her Biblical manuscripts, her ancient ritual and social customs.

The extracts and facts submitted in this paper will plainly show that among the chief sources of this most interesting knowledge of early Christian life, these Fayûm documents, illustrated by the loving and learned labours of their Viennese custodian and commentators, must ever take an honourable position.¹

GEORGE T. STOKES.

¹ I may perhaps mention that the last number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* contains a most interesting account of Christian novel reading and novel writers among the monks who swarmed all along the

THE STATER IN THE FISH'S MOUTH.

MATT. xvii. 24—27.

A GOOD deal of wit, not more irreverent than clumsy and stupid, has been directed against this incident. It has been spoken of as a “miracle for a dollar,” or half-a-crown, and even serious and intelligent men have found great difficulty in understanding how a fish could be hooked, and still hold a shekel in its mouth. Such difficulties I think we may leave to the practical angler.

But the ordinary devout Bible reader commonly misses the point and bearing of the miracle, because it is not sufficiently obvious in our translation that it was the Temple-tax which was being collected. In the Revised Version the proper rendering is given: “When they were come to Capernaum, they that received the half-shekel came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay the half-shekel?” Every Jew knew that the half-shekel was the tax appointed by Moses as the ransom of souls, and now collected annually for the upholding of the Temple. This tax was levied on every Israelite of twenty years of age and upwards, even the poorest. The pauper who had no money must beg it, or sell his under-garment. In whatever part of the world the Jew resided, he was obliged, and he was proud, to send up his half-shekel to Jerusalem. It was chiefly from this tribute that the Temple was enriched with those piles of silver which again and again tempted the avarice of the Romans. In the province of Galilee the tax

Nile Valley during the fifth century. They used to amuse themselves with the ancient pagan and pre-Christian Demotic novels, of which the French and German periodicals, like the *Revue Egyptologique*, have been giving most interesting specimens. As the ancient tongues died out, the monks set to work and composed Christian novels, wherein the various Christian sects and parties furnished the bad and good characters. Even Egyptian asceticism could not shut out the human craving after romance.

was levied by officials sent for the purpose between the 15th and 25th of the month Adar; and no force, no distraint was used by them, but if any did not then pay he was compelled to pay when he went up to Jerusalem to the feasts.

It was an official question therefore which was now put to Peter, and it was put courteously by officials who knew the extent of their powers, who knew that quite possibly there might be exemptions from the tax, and that they were mere collectors and not judges of appeals. It was not an entangling question, such as was afterwards put by the scribes, who asked if it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar. There was no question, nor could be any question, of the lawfulness and propriety of this tax; and all that the collectors wished to know was a mere matter of business for the arrangement of their accounts, whether Jesus wished to pay the tax in Capernaum, or at Jerusalem, or whether He Himself paid it or some one else for Him, or whether perhaps He had not some special claim for exemption. Especially, these collectors seem to have supposed Jesus might claim exemption as a teacher; for they do not name Him, but designate Him as "your teacher," showing that He was quite recognised in the district as exercising a spiritual function, and as one who might possibly on this ground think Himself worthy of being classed with the priests and Levites, who claimed exemption from the tax.

Peter, as usual, does not stop to think, but fancies he knows all about the matter, and promptly assures the collectors that his Master certainly considered Himself taxable. The conversation may have taken place at the door, the tax-gatherers having called for the purpose of making the inquiry, so that Jesus might both see the men and hear what their business was, and especially the loud voice of the fisherman uttering his emphatic "Yea." At

all events, no sooner does Peter come in than Jesus, without further introduction, says, "What thinkest thou, Simon? the kings of *the earth*, from whom do *they* receive toll or tribute? From their sons or from strangers?" Peter promptly answers, "From strangers." "Therefore," says our Lord, "the sons are free." The parable was so obvious that Peter at once understood what was meant, and our Lord added no explanation. It was obvious that if earthly kings did not tax the princes of their house, but only their subjects, the Heavenly King could require no tax from Him whom Peter had only a day or two ago acknowledged to be in a special sense the Son of God. For the Son to pay tax to the Father was an absurdity. The very name by which the Romans designated "children" was the word for "free." It was everywhere recognised that the father and the children of the house were one. If then Jesus was God's Son in a sense in which other Jews were not, Peter had been hasty in committing Him to the payment of this tax.

Had Peter been left to himself he would probably have sought to rectify his mistake by shouting after the tax-gatherers, who were still in sight, and telling them that his Master would not pay the tax. But Jesus at once shows him a better way out of the difficulty. He had no intention of standing upon His right and claiming exemption. His whole life was a foregoing of His rights as God's Son, and He who had not thought equality with the Father a thing to be grasped and tenaciously held, was not going to make a great fuss about paying 15*d*. He who had laid aside all the outward pomp of Divinity, and had come among men as one of themselves, born of a woman and made under the law, was not going to assert His superiority to this particular enactment of the law. It was quite true that He was God's Son, and that it was an incongruity in Him to be paying tax to Himself, for that

was what it amounted to; but men were not to be convinced of His Divinity by His standing upon His rights and compelling them to submit to Him, but by the unrivalled depth of His humiliation, by His Divine lowliness and meekness and power of submission. He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. He came appealing to far higher principles in us than our capacity for being struck with wonders and for admiring what is physically mighty. He appealed to our capacity for recognising spiritual greatness, and therefore it was His love He revealed in one prolonged humiliation. He submitted therefore to this tax, just as He submitted to baptism, to the law which required all Jews to appear at the feasts, and so on. Having submitted to become man, He need not stagger at any act which that involved.

But that Peter at least might clearly understand that this payment and every act of His human life was a voluntary humiliation, that he might in one mental view see both the dignity of his Master and the meekness with which He veiled that dignity, Jesus bid him go and find the money in the fish's mouth. While submitting to pay the tax as the least influential Jew might have done, He provides it in a manner which is meant to exhibit Him as the Lord of nature. That the miracle was necessary in order to furnish 2s. 6d. is scarcely credible. Peter seems to have had a comfortable house, and even making the extremely unlikely supposition that he had not a single shekel, he could very easily have borrowed it, or he could by half-an-hour's fishing have made it. But had the money been procured by such means the lesson would have been lost. When, however, Peter took his tackle, and went down to the lake and hooked a fish and found the coin, all as his Master had said, he cannot but have thought with himself, Certainly our Master is as humble as He bids us be; He has all nature at command, and yet makes no

sign to these tax-gatherers, but submits to be dunred for payment as if He were an obscure peasant. He bids us avoid giving offence, He bids us beware of doing what might be wrongly interpreted, He bids us accommodate ourselves to the ignorance and prejudice of those about us, and He Himself stoops to the smallest child and keeps step with the tottering and faltering feet. He sets a little child before us as the type of the humble disciple; but there is nothing which is fit to represent the humility of the Master, who, having all rights, asserts none, and, divesting Himself of His native authority, appears among us with nothing to awe but an unequalled goodness and lowliness.

This miracle then was meant to instruct. And that which it was meant especially to illustrate was the humility of Jesus. It was intended to follow up the teaching of the Transfiguration and of Peter's confession, and, on the other hand, to put in a concrete and visible form the teaching regarding humility which our Lord at this time gave to the disciples. The answer which Peter gave to the tax-gatherers showed that he had not thought out the consequences of his own confession. He had explicitly and emphatically acknowledged his Master to be the Son of God, and yet he admits that He was liable to be taxed. He did not observe the inconsistency. There was so much in the life of Jesus that *seemed* inconsistent with His being the Son of God that Peter had no clear perception of what was really consistent and what inconsistent. The Divinity of his Master lay for the most part so concealed from the superficial observer that, even in the mind of one who, like Peter, had once seen and owned His Divinity, it was apt to be taken very little account of. And yet it was of the utmost importance that Peter and all the Apostles and all of us should see deeper than the surface, even down to that point at which it becomes apparent that these acts of

humility are not only consistent with His Divinity, but are the fittest expressions of it. Peter was to be helped to see that the most Divine thing about our Lord was His becoming man and submitting day by day to all that was involved in that. And in this miracle he had his first easy lesson ; for in it he was himself the instrument at once of our Lord's Divinity and of His submission.

In the quiet, easy, and almost playful little parable by which our Lord exhibited to Peter what was involved in paying the tax, nothing is more obvious than that He claims to be the Son of God in a sense distinct from that in which all other Jews were God's children. For them He argues it was quite right to pay this tax : from Himself it cannot legally be required. To ask from Him the half-shekel which went to uphold God's house was to tax the Prince for the upkeep of the royal palace. In other words, He claimed to be more akin to God than to men ; He claimed to be of the family of God in a sense in which ordinary men were not.

But though our Lord had so valid a claim to be exempt, He was unwilling to push this claim. Indeed, had the tax-collectors come to Himself instead of to Peter, they would in all probability have received the same answer. Why then does our Lord make any remark on Peter's reply ? Plainly because from the prompt and easy manner in which Peter gave it, it was obvious that he had no idea of the ground on which Jesus paid the tax, but considered that being a pious Jew, He, like all other pious Jews, was glad to contribute to the Temple funds. But this superficial reason hid the true and radical reason, which was that the payment of this tax was merely one particular of that prolonged *voluntary* humiliation to which Christ was subjecting Himself.

Our Lord Himself assigns a reason for the payment : "Lest," He says, "we should offend," or become a cause

of stumbling. People would put a wrong construction on His conduct if He declined to pay. They would think He either despised the Temple or was in some form a heretic. The evilly-disposed might plead His example, and also refuse payment. His refusal would only make it more difficult for ordinary people to understand Him. It would do nobody any good, and might do a great deal of harm. No doubt this was not His fault; He had in various ways given men quite sufficient proof that He was Divine; it was their slowness and blindness which were to blame. Still, though it was their own fault—though it was discreditable ignorance in the authorities to allow Him to be taxed, He would not act as if they ought to have been prepared to acknowledge His supremacy, but would be conciliatory, oblivious of the wrong done to Him.

To all followers of Christ, then, as well as to these first disciples, this action of our Lord says, Forego your rights rather than cause any ignorant person to stumble at your conduct. An *offence* or stumbling-block is anything laid before a person, and which makes it more difficult for them to do right. “Woe to that man,” says our Lord, “by whom the offence cometh—by whom the stumbling-block is laid in another’s path.” We are very apt to justify ourselves when our conduct has been misconstrued by ignorant people, and has done them harm, either by encouraging them to do what is wrong in them though right in us, or by provoking them to speak evil of us: we are very apt to justify ourselves by maintaining that it was not we who were in fault, but the person who stumbled—that he ought to have known better—that had he not been so ignorant, so narrow-minded, so evilly-disposed, he could not have stumbled at our conduct; and if he was so weak as to find occasion for falling in so slight a matter, it makes very little difference that I happened to be the cause of his stumbling,

for he would have stumbled at something else if not at that. "Yes," says our Lord, "it is quite true; it must needs be that offences come: but woe to that man by whom they come." All men die, but murder is not on that account a venial sin. All men meet stumbling-blocks in their path through life, but to be the occasion of a man's stumbling is no slight offence.

We are frequently in circumstances in which this principle should guide us. We may feel that we have perfect liberty to do such and such things; but if the doing of them be not necessary or binding on our conscience, then before we use our liberty we must consider further what impression our conduct is likely to make on others. Of course there are also occasions, as every one knows, when we are called upon to assert our opinions and principles, regardless of consequences; but, as our Lord insists, there are times—and these very frequent—when we must be guided by the opinions of others, even though we know these to be erroneous. We may, *e.g.*, be quite sure it does us no harm to study science on Sunday, or to read very secular literature; we may feel sure we are the better and not the worse for going to the theatre, and we may be thoroughly convinced that it is a limitation of our Christian liberty if we are prevented from going. That may be true, but that does not exhaust the question; we must further ask whether our using what we feel to be our liberty will not encourage some one who sees things less clearly than we do to take the same liberties, and so dull his moral sensibility by accepting our guidance rather than the guidance of his own conscience. "It is his fault," you say; "he ought to know better." No doubt it is his fault, but it is you who bring upon him the consequences of his ignorance. Instead of enlightening, you embolden and harden him, and so do him what may be irreparable injury. For the man who has over-ridden his own conscience has put out or seriously

injured the eye of his spirit, by which alone he can walk safely.

And how much do we all need the general lesson of humility taught us by our Lord. In presence of His quiet and meek disposition, that does not strive and cry, how ashamed may we be of our pretentiousness and insistence on our rights! How sensitive are we to every neglect; how indignant if our rightful place is not given us—if we are not recognised—if our work is not appreciated—if our opinion is not listened to! Here is the Son of God passing through life unrecognised, unworshipped, contradicted, despised, mocked by ignorant persons, and He says nothing of His dignity, when reviled, reviles not again; while we feel deeply injured if on one occasion we do not get all our due, and are continually craving recognition, and cannot bear to be considered less useful, or less liberal, or less clever, or less full of information, or less alive to great questions than we are. How we quarrel and sulk and stand upon our dignity if we are not treated with deference! What a pitiful spectacle does humanity often afford!

In closing, it is, I think, worth while to observe what was implied in this law of the half shekel, although this is not strictly in the line of our subject. The law ran, "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord to make an atonement for your souls," a law which evidently was intended to impress upon the people a sense of their equality before God. All Jews had an equal right of access to God; and all had an equal interest in the Temple; the king contributed, at least through the regular tax, no more than the poorest of his subjects. There can be no question that this went far to produce a feeling of religious equality among the people. If a man's poverty laid him under serious disabilities and disadvantages in society, it laid him under no religious disabilities. He

enjoyed precisely the same right as the rich to enter the Temple and engage in its worship. He felt that in God's sight wealth made no distinction. The poor man's prayer was as likely to be heard ; the poor man's offering as sure to be accepted. God looked upon all His people, irrespective of social position, and simply as men.

And this is a feeling which should, by one means or other, be continually propagated. The least among us has his responsibilities ; there is no one so weak, so uninfluential, so absolutely impoverished, that he is expected to contribute nothing to the common stock of duty done—it will not do to rob God under the guise of modesty or humility, and profess to be unable to do any good. Your half-shekels must be forthcoming. And there is no one so remote from the great centre, no one so far removed by disposition or by habit from the mass of Christian worshippers, no one so forgotten by men and disregarded, that he is not known by God and cared for by Him. The distinctions that separate us in society fall from us as we enter God's presence, and we feel that God is as likely to listen to the supplications of the poor and the helpless, as of the rich and mighty.

Perhaps there is also significance in the circumstance that our Lord miraculously paid Peter's tax as well as His own. He did not include Peter in the law which applied to Himself, nor did He claim exemption from the tax for Peter ; and yet the furnishing him with the half-shekel must have seemed to Peter to mean more than if He had given him it out of the common purse. He might not see all it meant, but when he heard our Lord a few days afterwards saying to the Jews, "If the Son make you free, then are ye free indeed," his mind must surely have reverted to this incident. For Christ did make him, to a certain extent, a sharer in His own Sonship. He supplied him out of His Father's treasury, giving him an inkling of the truth,

afterwards to be set in the clearest light, that in Christ we are all the children of God, and that in Him we *get from* God far more than ever we can give to Him.

There is a freedom which certainly the Jews had not attained, and which, it is to be feared few Christians attain. Even in intelligent and pious people there is always a notion that what God wants is the fifteen pence. There remains in us a servile, tax-paying spirit, which throws doubt upon our sonship. Now Christ distinctly declares that such a relation between God and us as moves us to offer Him payments, large or small, is to be abolished. That is not the relation God wishes us to hold towards Him. He means us to be free. He means us to enter into the freedom of His own Son; to learn from Him a free spirit and bearing, and as His friends to look up to God as our Father. He desires no service that is done by constraint, no offering that is a mere paying of taxes. He wishes us to count ourselves His children, and to live on what He supplies, fearlessly, cheerfully, hopefully.

Every other liberty is against nature and must end in more hateful bondage. Had Peter refused to pay his tax, and out of mere selfwill and independence and greed evaded the collectors, he would have been arrested in Jerusalem and imprisoned till he paid. So short-lived is the flash of apparent liberty a man secures to himself by disregard of God and His love, and contempt of everything but his own pleasure. It is folly and madness to seek liberty so. The world were a hateful world if men could find true freedom in selfishness, and apart from love and God and holiness. The freedom we are destined to is of no such pitiful kind—but an absolute and eternal freedom, grounded in our harmony with God and our consciousness of His perfect love for us. The man who is conscious of this, who knows that God is with him and he in God—the man who knows that God has made all things for His children rather than

for Himself, and that all things are ours because they are God's—this is the man who has true freedom. Conscious that he loves God above all, he is not haunted by the fear of offending Him, nor is tormented with scruples, but lets his love rule his life.

MARCUS DODS.

INDEX.

Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D.	PAGE
The Miraculous Conception	293
Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
The Epistle to the Hebrews:	
I. Introductory	161
II. Christ and the Prophets	341
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
The Use of Mythic Phrases by the Old Testament Writers	20
Survey of Recent Old Testament Literature	73
The Book of Isaiah in the Revised Version	279
Rev. Professor S. Ives Curtiss, D.D., Ph.D.	
Recent Old Testament Studies in America	78, 154
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	
The Prophet Joel	198
Rev. W. L. Davidson, LL.D.	
The Mediator-Argument of Galatians iii. 19, 20	377
Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.	
The Last State Worse than the First	123
Survey of Recent New Testament Literature	309
The Stater in the Fish's Mouth	461
Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie, D.D.	
Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	29
At the Sign of the Bible	146, 395
Ven. Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.	
Characteristics of Modern English Exegesis	1
The Books of the Apocrypha	321
Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D.	
The Pastoral Epistles, or the Closing Labours of the Apostle Paul	45
The Epistle to the Hebrews:	
The Note of Warning to the Judeo-Christian Churches	241

	PAGE
Rev. R. F. Horton, M.A.	
Christ's Use of the Book of Proverbs	105
A. Taylor Innes, M.A.	
A Forgotten Poet	212
Dr. A. Neubauer.	
Jewish Controversy and the "Pugio Fidei"	81, 179
T. E. Page, M.A., Charterhouse.	
Critical Notes on the Lord's Prayer	433
Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D.	
This Do in Remembrance of Me	441
Rev. F. Rendall, M.A.	
History of the Word "Eternal"	266
Notes on the Acts of the Apostles i.-vi.	353
Rev. F. Herbert Stead, M.A.	
The Chief Pauline Names for Christ	386
Rev. Professor G. T. Stokes, D.D.	
The Latest Discoveries among the Fayûm Manuscripts . .	449
Rev. Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D.	
Recent American Literature on the New Testament . .	158
Rev. Professor Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A.	
Franz Delitzsch and August Dillmann on the Pentateuch .	132
Professor A. S. Wilkins, LL.D., Litt.D.	
The Language Used by the Apostles	420
Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D.	
Advice about Commentaries :	
I. The Pentateuch and Joshua	228
The Pre-Christian Jewish Interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii.	
	364, 401
The Editor.	
Brevia :	
The Revolution in Tanner's Lane	239

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i.	152	Matthew xvii. 24-27	461
iv. 7	151	xxiv. 29	208
Psalm xxii. 3	20	Mark xiv. 3-9	395
xlviii. 2	22	xiv. 22	451
ci.	116-148	Luke i. 35	293
Proverbs iii. 18	116	xi. 2-5	433
iii. 28	111	xxii. 19	441
vi. 25	112	John iii. 13.	106
viii. 27	106	xii. 1-8	395
ix. 1-6	117	xviii. 23	123
x. 12	112	Acts i.-vii.	353
x. 30	109	i. 16-22	421
xi. 17	110	iii. 12-26	425
xii. 20	110	iv. 8-12	426
xv. 27	112	Romans xi. 12	413
xvi. 3	113	xii. 1, 2	63
xvi. 19	109	xii. 8	65
xxi. 3	107	1 Corinthians x. 11	272
xxii. 9	111	xi. 24	441
xxii. 11	110	xii. 28	64
xxiv. 17	111	xii. 31	211
xxv. 21	111	2 Corinthians v. 21	417
xxvi. 4	114	Galatians iii. 19-20	377
xxviii. 9	114	Philippians	45
xxix. 13	111	1 Timothy	51
Song of Solomon i. 7-8	398	vi. 12, 19	277
Isaiah xiv. 12, 13	27	v. 18	68
xxix. 1, 2	22	2 Timothy	53
xxxiii. 7	22	iv. 5	62
xl. 3	280	Titus	53
xli. 15	405	i. 5	61
xlii. 1-4	282	i. 9	66
xlii. 19	283	Hebrews	161, 241
xlv. 9	285	i. 1-4	341
lili., lili.	364, 401	ii. 1	166
lili.	289	v. 8, 9	416
lxii. 6	291	vi. 6-8	166
Daniel xii. 2, 3	271	vi. 20	167, 171
Joel	198	ix. 26	272
Matthew v.-vii.	109	x. 19-22	172
vi. 9-13	433	x. 32	165
xii. 19	106	1 Pet i. 11	401
xii. 38-45; xvi. 1-4	123	Jude 6	266
xiii. 40	272	Revelation xiv. 14	208

